DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 814 IR 050 471

TITLE	Collection Description and Assessment in ARL Libraries. SPEC Kit 87.
INSTITUTION	Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C. Office of Management Studies.
PUB DATE	Sep 82
NOTE	125p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Systems, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20036 ($15.00 per kit to non-members, $7.50 per kit to members).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Guides - General (050) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Libraries; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Library Acquisition; *Library Collections; Library Networks; Library Planning; Measurement Techniques; *Research Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	*Collection Assessment

ABSTRACT

This group of documents presents material on collection development and a list of collection intensity indicators from the Research Libraries Group (RLG), as well as examples of collection assessment techniques from seven members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). ARL member documents cover the assessment of art periodical, microbiology, Spanish-American literature, and women's studies holdings at Arizona State University; collection assessment planning at Brigham Young University; assessment of French literature, computer science, and United States history holdings at the University of California at San Diego; the results of a book use study at DePauw University; assessment of the sociology collection at the University of Illinois; assessment of the metallurgical engineering collection at the University of Notre Dame; and the general procedures of Stanford University's collection evaluation program. A concise summary of issues and trends describes political and operational incentives for collection assessment; obstacles to assessment programs; and assessment approaches involving the comparison of holdings with authoritative lists of published material, shelf list measurement, cooperative collection development and preservation decisionmaking, measurement of user satisfaction with library holdings, and the use of automated systems in quantitative assessment methods. An evaluation sheet for this ARL Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) kit is also provided. (ESR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235814

spec

September 1982 OMS

Systems and Procedures Exchange Center

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Collection Description and Assessment in ARL Libraries

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maxine Sitts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Kit 87

IR050471

The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) is operated by the Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Telephone (202) 232-8656.

USES OF SPEC KITS

The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) is a clearinghouse operated by the Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies that provides a central source of timely information and materials on the management and operations of large academic and research libraries. It facilitates the exchange of knowledge and documents through SPEC Kits, which are distributed ten times each year to ARL members and other interested libraries. The Kits include topically-arranged groupings of unedited primary source documents – selected for their value to administrators and decision-makers – that illustrate a wide range of alternative approaches to specfic issues.

Kit documents come from general membership surveys and from selected libraries contacted directly by SPEC, and most Kits are produced within six months of surveys. The documents' value comes from their variety of ideas, methods, and solutions. They are not viewed as finished products, but rather as points of departure for a library's planning efforts and as stimulants to innovative approaches to problem-solving. As such, Kits do not present answers or prescriptions for any one library; instead they illustrate how selected ARL members are planning for or dealing with particular issues. The worth of any one Kit to a particular library will depend upon the specific topic covered and the library's stage of development in that area.

Materials are selected according to the following criteria:

- Presents an approach of potential value to administrators and decision-makers
- Timely, and dealing directly with the topic under consideration
- Probability of application of ideas or thinking to other library situations
- Illustrative of actual practice, rather than theoretical
- Understandable, readable communication

All together, the materials should provide a range of alternative approaches that complement each other, provide variety, and stimulate comparison and contrast.

Libraries can take advantage of the Kit compilations in a number of ways. Administrators can evaluate the assumptions, methods, and results of other libraries' approaches; compare and contrast them; and use the learnings in their own situations. Library staff members can use the kits as professional development and current awareness tools. Committees and task forces can use them to begin a review of current practices. And the Kits can identify other persons or places to contact for further information. Back-up files in the SPEC office also are available for loan to member libraries. In addition, SPEC will conduct on-demand surveys or analyses geared specifically for a single library.

EVALUATION

Kit Title/Number _____

1. Which uses did the library make of this Kit?

2. Please indicate how useful the Kit was for these purposes.

☐ Very Useful ☐ Quite Useful ☐ Somewhat Useful ☐ Not Useful

3. Do you have suggestions for this Kit or for future Kits?

(optional)

NAME _____

LIBRARY _____

PHONE _____

Please return this form to the SPEC Center, OMS/ARL, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

1/82

SEPTEMBER 1982 #87

OMS

Systems and Procedures Exchange Center

COLLECTION DESCRIPTION AND ASSESSMENT IN ARL LIBRARIES

ISSN 0160 3574

Description and assessment of collections in academic and research libraries has become increasingly important during the past several years. Libraries' purchasing power has decreased steadily while the pressures to support college and university programs have, at best, remained stable. At the same time, universities and their components are facing increased demands for accountability, requiring more specific justification for their budget allocations. In this environment libraries have several incentives for developing and operating active programs of collection description and assessment.

The relationships among collection description, collection policy development, and collection assessment have been clearer in the literature than in practice. Collection description generally refers to quantitative measures, such as number of volumes or number of serial titles in particular subjects. Collection policies are descriptions of what the library thinks it ought to be collecting in particular areas, based on considerations of factors like current and emerging academic and research programs and historic collection strengths. Collection assessment typically refers either to the degree of match between the collection and the policy, or to the success of the collection in fulfilling user demands. In practice, assessments frequently describe collections in terms of whether their parts are at the instructional, research or comprehensive level: the results of such description-assessments often become, ipso facto, the policy. What many libraries discover is that, having described or assessed their collections, they need then to go through an analysis to determine what collections should be rather than what they are.

INCENTIVES. On the political level, collection description and assessment can indicate to administrators and faculty that the library is fulfilling one of its primary responsibilities - the maintenance of resources in support of academic and research programs. Combined with data on costs of library material, assessments also can provide to university administrators the information needed to make informed judgements on library budget requirements to build and maintain adequate collections. For teaching and research faculty, collection description and assessment provides a basis for forming realistic expectations of what kinds of material the collection is likely to include and what kinds of research it is likely to support.

On the operational level, the identification of collection strengths and weaknesses allows the library to make informed decisions on the allocation of funds - for example, to maintain strengths and to fill gaps. When assessments are viewed in the context of academic and research program trends, allocations can more readily be adjusted to reflect current and emerging needs. Selectors and bibliographers can learn a considerable amount about their areas of responsibility by carrying out an assessment, can gain a greater understanding of the literature in those areas, and can make more informed selection decisions in the future. Assessment programs also provide an opportunity for greater library-faculty collaboration, both in developing the approach to assessing a particular area of the collection and in reporting and acting on the results.

Collection description and assessment has the potential to become a significant component of emerging resource sharing and preservation programs. Libraries working toward cooperative collection development programs are finding that standard approaches to determining and reporting collection strengths and weaknesses provide essential information for making collective decisions on acquisitions responsibilities. Similarly, it is apparent that statewide, regional and national approaches to preservation can be aided by a common understanding of where strong collections exist and by the recognition that libraries' preservation responsibilities should relate to their collection strengths.

The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) is operated by the Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Telephone (202) 232-8656.

OBSTACLES. A comprehensive collection assessment program requires considerable commitment on the part of bibliographers and selectors, and the benefits have not always been easily demonstrated. In addition, available assessment techniques continue to rely heavily on the professional, but subjective, judgements of individual selectors and bibliographers. Many of these collection development staff, faced with the perceived need to maintain collections at current levels with reduced purchasing power, are not easily persuaded of the usefulness of reviewing their policies and the collections.

APPROACHES. Most assessment programs rely primarily on the traditional approach of identifying authoritative lists of published material to check against holdings. When such lists are not readily available, selectors frequently work with faculty to identify core material, or develop lists from dissertations' bibliographies. If the intent of the assessment is only to determine the relative strength of the collection, the selector often will use sampling techniques; if the intent is to develop a list of desiderata, complete lists usually are checked. Another approach used for some time is shelf list measurement, which can provide comparative data among libraries on relative size, if not necessarily quality, of collections in specific parts of the L.C. classification schedule.

During the last two years members of the Research Libraries Group (with the Library of Congress) have developed an approach to collection description and assessment that provides information for cooperative collection development and preservation decisions. The approach requires participants to identify their libraries' historic and current collecting strengths in specific L.C. classes and to share those data online to assist both local and collective decisions on collection development and preservation. While individual selectors and bibliographers have considerable latitude in how they assess their respective collections - and many have been able to rely on their personal knowledge of the fields and their collections - preliminary validity checks indicate that the relative judgements are sound. One intent of this project has been to assign primary collection and preservation responsibilities among the participating libraries. The ARL Task Force on Collection Development has tested this approach in five ARL libraries and is considering steps to develop it further and apply it on a broader scale. During this same period several libraries participating in the OMS's Collection Analysis Project have focused on developing comprehensive assessment programs.

Other libraries have used client-centered assessment approaches that rely on measures of user satisfaction, or perceived satisfaction, as the primary indicator of collection adequacy. The Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM) has developed a manual for collection use studies which was tested successfully in three of their member libraries and is now being further tested by the OMS in four small colleges in the Southeast before publication later this year. While originally designed for small academic libraries, the procedure is easily adapted for large library systems' branches, or undergraduate libraries. Some participants in the Collection Analysis Project have carried out access studies which measure users' success in obtaining needed material and determine the reasons for failures. The SUNY Office of Library Services and the SUNY/OCLC Network have developed programs to analyze and assess disciplinary collection strength and degree of overlap among library collections. The programs have been tested with a group of nine libraries and results of that test will be reported in the Fall 1982 issue of the Bookmark, published by the New York State Library.

TRENDS. There is now a greater range of quantitative approaches to assessment, some of which use existing automated systems. For example, RLG has developed an online data base of members' collection descriptions and assessments; SUNY is utilizing OCLC tapes to do overlap studies; and the ACM approach can utilize records from automated circulation systems. The renewed emphasis on assessment has led to a greater understanding of the issues involved in the book fund allocation process and has contributed to the development of a better trained and more knowledgeable corps of bibliographers and selectors. In many institutions, collection assessment programs have helped to educate faculty and administrators on the library's collection needs. But perhaps the most significant development is the movement toward using standard collection assessment techniques to contribute to collective action in collection development and preservation.

SPEC Kit #87 (September 1983, 117 pages) contains eight examples of collection assessment techniques, with several from Collection Analysis Project final reports. SPEC kits are available by subscription from the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, Office of Management Studies/ARL, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Individual kits may be purchased — prepaid only — for $15.00 (U.S.) with a check made payable to "ARL Office of Management Studies." Library members of ARL receive kits for $7.50.

ISSN # 0160 3582

COLLECTION DESCRIPTION AND ASSESSMENT IN ARL LIBRARIES

SPEC KIT #87 -- SEPTEMBER 1982

This Kit updates SPEC Kit #41 (February 1978),
"Collection Assessment in ARl Libraries"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RLG Collection Development Manual. Second Edition. The Research Libraries Group, Inc. 1981. 1

"Individual Assessments from Collection Assessment Task Force Report" in Arizona State University Library Collection Analysis Report. 1978. 14

"Planning the Assessment" in Collection Assessment Manual. Brigham Young University. 1981. 35

Collection Effectiveness Task Force Report, submitted to the CAP Study Team. University of California at San Diego. 1979. 44

"Appendix V. Book Use Study" in DePauw University Libraries Self Study Report. 1982. 59

Social Science Task Force Report, Collection Analysis and Management Project. University of Illinois. 1982. 76

Task Force on Collection Assessment Final Report. Collection Analysis Project. University of Notre Dame. 1981. 99

The Collection Evaluation Program. Stanford University Libraries. 1977. (Repeated from earlier Kit) 109

SEE ALSO: Guidelines for Collection Development. David L. Perkins, editor. Collection Development Committee, Resources and Technical Services Division, American Library Association. 1979. 78 pages.

RLG COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT MANUAL

Second Edition

The Research Libraries Group, Inc.
Stanford, California

© Copyright 1980, 1981 by
The Research Libraries Group, Inc.
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

Reproduced with permission

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This manual was first devised by RLG's Program Coordination Division in the summer of 1980. The policies were developed by the Collection Management and Development Committee. In May 1981, the contents were reorganized and expanded and the entire manual reprinted. The material has been written, edited, formatted, and is maintained through WYLBUR, SCRIPT, and SYSPUB, text-editing and -formatting systems available on the campus computer of Stanford University's Center for Information Technology.

The manual is printed in looseleaf form in expectation of future updates. Any future alterations in text are expected to incorporate the review comments and suggestions of the manual's users.

CONTENTS

		page
1.	COOPERATIVE COLLECTION MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	1
	Introduction	1
	Basic Assumptions	1
	The Conspectus	2
BEING REVISED:	Work Plan	2
	Timetable for Conspectus Development	4
NOT INCLUDED IN KIT	Primary Collecting Responsibility	5
2.	COLLECTION INTENSITY INDICATORS	1
	RLG Codes	1
	Library of Congress Intensity Levels	3
	Language Codes	4
3.	LIST OF SELECTION OFFICERS	1
4.	CONSPECTUS FOR CHINESE, JAPANESE, AND KOREAN VERNACULAR	1
	Introduction	1
	Conspectus Table of Contents	2
	Conspectus Worksheets for Chinese, Japanese, and Korean	26
5.	CONSPECTUS FOR LINGUISTICS, LANGUAGES, AND LITERATURES	1
	Introduction	1
	Conspectus Table of Contents	3
	Conspectus Worksheets for Language, Literature, and Linguistics	89
6.	CONSPECTUS FOR ART AND ARCHITECTURE	1
	Introduction	1
	Conspectus Table of Contents	2

1. COOPERATIVE COLLECTION MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Cooperative Collection Management and Development is one of the four principal programs of the Research Libraries Group, Inc. It is closely tied to the other programs in preservation, shared resources, and technical services and will rely heavily on the union catalogs that reside in the data base of the Research Libraries Information Network. The program is directed by RLG's Collection Management and Development Committee, which comprises one representative from each full and associate member institution, working through the Program Coordination Division of RLG's central staff. The present chairman of the Collection Management and Development Committee is David H. Stam, Director of the Research Libraries at New York Public Library. The Vice-Chairman is Paul Mosher, Associate Director for Collection Development at Stanford University Libraries. Central staff direction is provided by Nancy E. Gwinn, Associate Director of Program Coordination at RLG.

1.2 BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

RLG's Cooperative Collection Management and Development Program is founded on several basic assumptions.

1. Increases in library acquisitions budgets over the next decade will not keep pace with inflation, nor with the growing volume of published and unpublished material essential to the support of scholarship.

2. Processing economies, primarily from shared on-line cataloging, will not substantially relieve the growing pressure on acquisitions budgets.

3. Most libraries will, consciously or unconsciously, deliberately or involuntarily, make recissions in collecting policies to accommodate economic realities. In fact, most research libraries, including many RLG institutions, have already reduced their collection activities.

4. Widespread and substantial recissions, implemented individually and without consultation with other libraries, could lead to wholesale withdrawal from some fields, and consequent harm to research and scholarship nationwide. Coordinated planning is therefore essential.

5. As a practical matter, all university libraries must continue to support, with their local collections, the regular needs of their instructional programs, and general reference for all fields in which their faculties and/or students conduct active research. However, given present capabilities for rapid delivery of book-form and documentary materials, and for facsimile transmission, a library (meaning also the university and its faculty) can rely on expedited borrowing for access to material occasionally needed for research, but not for instruction. The average item in a research library is used only once in ten years.

6. The long-term goal of cooperative collection development is to ensure that resources are available to preserve somewhere research-level collections in all fields of program interest.

1.3 THE CONSPECTUS

Coordinated collection development requires that changes in collection and in individual selections be based on the policies and decisions of other members. Information about individual decisions will be available on-line in RLIN when the acquisitions system is introduced in 1981. Information about policies is gathered in a basic document by individual subjects called a conspectus. This document is a matrix of data arranged by member library and subject class. In the RLG version, member libraries are arranged along the horizontal axis, subject area descriptors along the vertical axis. Both axes are expandable. The horizontal axis will grow as new member institutions join RLG (and, perhaps, as data from nonmember institutions is included); the vertical axis can be expanded with additional subject descriptors if and as the initial list proves inadequate. At present, subject descriptors for each field are derived from Library of Congress subject classifications or other appropriate classification schemes, modified and expanded as necessary to describe adequately the collections of RLG member libraries. The matrix is then filled in with values representing:

(1) existing collection strength
(2) current collecting intensity

These values are single digit numbers from 0 to 5 defined in Part 2 of this document. The RLG conspectus for each subject field is maintained on-line through the Stanford Campus Computer Facility so that values can be modified and updated. Members cannot look at this information on-line at this time, but will be able to do so eventually. Meanwhile, the information is maintained by the Program Operations Manager at RLG, who supplies periodic printouts to the Collection Management offices at RLG member institutions; each data set is also included as a section in this manual.

1.4 WORK PLAN

The RLG conspectus will be built in successive phases. Our attention will be directed initially to relatively small but disproportionately expensive collection areas and to large (and for that reason alone expensive) subject areas. Foreign area vernacular collections are good examples of the first case; language, literature, and linguistics (P-PZ) are good examples of the second. *National Shelflist Measurement* (1977) shows that P-PZ accounts for 24 percent of the 27,000,000 titles represented in the survey. If the field of history is broadly described -- not only as LC classes C, D, E, and F but also to include allied literature in the social sciences -- historical material would account for another 20 to 25 percent. Thus, on completing a conspectus for language, literature, and linguistics; history and allied fields; and one or more foreign

area studies RLG will have assembled data on about 60 percent of its aggregate collections. In this manner, RLG can expect to organize and distribute the largest amount of useful information at the least cost to its member libraries.

Accordingly, RLG's Collection Management and Development Committee has tentatively adopted the following priorities for conspectus preparation:

1. Chinese, Japanese, and Korean vernacular collections
2. Language, Literature, and Linguistics
3. History, its auxiliary sciences, and related fields
4. Science
5. Fine Arts
6. Philosophy and Religion
7. Music
8. Anthropology
9. Psychology
10. Social Science
11. Recreation
12. Education
13. Political Science

Obviously, these sections will overlap. When this occurs, a conspectus will reference data already gathered. Moreover, conspectus building might end before the universe of knowledge has been surveyed. Because the process is useful only to the point of diminishing returns, the cost of data gathering for some fields may be greater than the savings to be derived from cooperation in those fields.

For each conspectus (or section thereof) work proceeds in phases. The first phase is definition of appropriate subject descriptors; the second, contribution of values from member libraries; the third, verification of contributed data; the fourth, assignment of primary collecting responsibilities where appropriate; and the fifth, local actions resulting from such assignment. A full conspectus (i.e., data for all fields where such data is likely to be economically worthwhile) will take 18-24 months to build, but because data will be modified in response to changing budgets, priorities, academic program revisions, and so on, managing the Cooperative Collection Development Program of RLG will continue indefinitely.

1.5 TIMETABLE FOR CONSPECTUS DEVELOPMENT

YEAR AND MONTH

Subject	1981 J F M A M J J A S O N D	1982 J F M A M J J A S O N D
C,J,K Vernacular	T T T A A A	
Language (P-PZ)	T T T A A A	
History (C,D,E,F)	D D T T T T T A A A A A	
Auxiliary Sciences of History	D D T T T T A A A A	
Sciences (Q)	D D T T T T A A A A	
Fine Arts	D T T T T A A A A	
Philosophy (B)	D T T T T A A A A	
Music (M)	D D D D T T T T A A A A	
Anthropology (G)	S S D D D D T T T T A A A A	
Psychology (BJ)	S S D D D D T T T T A A A	
Social Sciences (H)	S S S S S D D D D T T T T A A A	
Recreation (G)	S S D D D D T T T T A A A A	
Education (L)	S S D D D D T T T T A A A A	
Political Science (J)	S S D D D D T T T T A A A	

S = Subject Descriptors
D = Data Contribution
T = Data Input and Analysis
A = Assignment of primary collecting responsibility

1.6 PRIMARY COLLECTING RESPONSIBILITY

As defined by the founding institutions (Harvard University, Yale University, Columbia University, and New York Public Library, hereafter described as RLG I), the term "primary collecting responsibility" refers to a subject, geographic area, or form of material for which one member library has agreed to accept collection responsibility for the consortium. When an area is accepted for primary collection responsibility by one member, the other members have the option of continuing or modifying their existing collection policies.

A member library assuming primary collecting responsibility accepts the following responsibilities:

- To continue collecting at least at the existing level as when the assignment became effective. A library will not be assigned primary collecting responsibility for a subject or geographic area unless it collects at least at level 4, as defined under Section 2.1 of this manual. Nor will a library be assigned primary collecting responsibility unless it collects at least 50 percent of what is available. For each area assigned, the library will notify the RLG Collection Management and Development Committee of its current and retrospective collection policy.

- To maintain materials in good condition as defined by the RLG Preservation Committee, to the extent that local budgets and policy permit. Multi-volume sets and serial titles in need of preservation microfilming should be submitted for consideration to the RLG Collection Management and Development Committee.

- To maintain files of serial runs in as-complete-as-possible state and to accept master copy responsibility for serial titles.

- To make materials available to RLG users within the scope of the RLG Shared Resources Program.

- To continue processing materials and to make them bibliographically accessible at least to the level maintained at the time the assignment is accepted.

The following is a list, established in RLG I, of assignments for primary collecting responsibilities.

2. COLLECTION INTENSITY INDICATORS

2.1 RLG CODES

In RLG documents, numbers 0 through 5, supplemented when necessary by an appropriate language code, describe existing collection strength and current collecting intensity. It is important to emphasize several points:

- These values describe collections or collecting absolutely, not relatively. They assume a national perspective, broad cognizance of bibliography in each field, familiarity with the holdings of the largest and best collections, and knowledge of current publication and book trade data.

- When the value describes existing collection strength, it should relate to (or at least not be in conflict with) national shelflist measurement. The value should reflect what is really on the shelves.

- When the value describes current collecting intensity, it represents actual collecting practice(i.e., what is really being added to the collection each year) not policy (what ought to be) if that policy is being imperfectly observed.

- For RLG purposes, the most crucial distinction is that made between a level 3 collection and a level 4 collection. Level three collections are adequate for local needs; level four collections are national investments, attracting scholars and researchers who normally work elsewhere.

The numbers are defined as follows:

0 Out of Scope: The library does not collect in this area.

1. Minimal Level: A subject area in which few selections are made beyond very basic works.

2. Basic Information Level: A collection of up-to-date general materials that serve to introduce and define a subject and to indicate the varieties of information available elsewhere. It may include dictionaries, encyclopedias, selected editions of important works, historical surveys, bibliographies, handbooks, a few major periodicals, in the minimum number that will serve the purpose. A basic information collection is not sufficiently intensive to support any courses or independent study in the subject area involved.

3. Instructional Support Level: A collection that is adequate to support undergraduate and MOST graduate instruction, or sustained independent study; that is, adequate to maintain knowledge of a subject required for limited or generalized purposes, of less than research intensity. It includes a wide range of basic monographs, complete collections of the works of more important writers, selections from the works of secondary writers, a selection of representative journals, and the reference tools and fundamental bibliographical apparatus pertaining to the subject.

4. Research Level: A collection that includes the major published source materials required for dissertations and independent research, including materials containing research reporting, new findings, scientific experimental results, and other information useful to researchers. It is intended to include all important reference works and a wide selection of specialized monographs, as well as a very extensive collection of journals and major indexing and abstracting services in the field. Older material is retained for historical research.

5. Comprehensive Level: A collection in which a library endeavors, so far as is reasonably possible, to include all significant works of recorded knowledge (publications, manuscripts, other forms), in all applicable languages, for a necessarily defined and limited field. This level of collecting intensity is one that maintains a "special collection"; the aim, if not the achievement, is exhaustiveness. Older material is retained for historical research.

2.2 LIBRARY OF CONGRESS INTENSITY LEVELS

The intensity levels used by the Library of Congress are included here for information.

- Minimal Level: A subject area in which the Library limits its acquisitions to one or more dictionaries, encyclopedias, bibliographies, handbooks, histories, and textbooks in the latest or best editions, as well as a few major periodicals (and most copyright deposits). A minimal-level collection is one dealing with a subject that is outside the scope of the Library and that will not support research in the subject. Retrospective materials are limited to those titles indispensable to research in the subject; titles of secondary importance are not selected.

- Reference Level: A subject area in which the Library acquires all the basic reference tools as well as the major journals, texts, and monographs (including most copyright deposits). A reference level collection is one that is adequate to maintain knowledge of a subject required for limited or general purposes. (It does not support extensive research for Congress or other governmental use.)

- Research Level: A subject area in which the Library acquires all the basic reference tools and all important books, pamphlets, and serials in all important editions regardless of language. It also includes an ample selection of less important current works (as well as most copyright deposits), including research reporting, new findings, and scientific experimental results. A research-level collection is one that is adequate to serve the needs of other government agencies and the pursuit of advanced research by academic scholars and others. Retrospective material is limited to the most important authors, editions, or landmarks in the history of the subject.

- Comprehensive Level: A subject area in which the Library endeavors to acquire everything written on the subject in all editions and languages excepting such minor items as reprints and notices and most translations. A comprehensive collection is one that aims for exhaustiveness.

Library of Congress collection strengths and collecting intensities are considered equivalent to RLG levels as follows:

LC Comprehensive Level	= RLG 5
LC Research Level	= RLG 4
LC Reference Level	= RLG 3
LC Minimal Level	= RLG 2

2.3 LANGUAGE CODES

The following language codes may be added to the numbers when the codes usefully qualify the values reported. Language codes should be omitted when they are superfluous. (For example, it goes without saying that a research-level collection in French history will be primarily in French; the "Y" is understood and may be omitted.) Language codes should be applied consistently throughout the worksheet, line by line. The "Comments" section should not be used to indicate general language levels. The use of language codes for collections at level 3 or higher is encouraged so that potential assignments for primary collecting responsibilities can more easily be determined.

Language Coverage Codes

E - English language material predominates; little or no foreign language material in the collection.

F - Selected foreign language material included, in addition to the English language material.

W - Wide selection of foreign language material in all applicable languages.

Y - Material is primarily in one foreign language.

2.3 LANGUAGE CODES

The following language codes may be added to the numbers when the codes usefully qualify the values reported. Language codes should be omitted when they are superfluous. (For example, it goes without saying that a research-level collection in French history will be primarily in French; the "Y" is understood and may be omitted.) Language codes should be applied consistently throughout the worksheet, line by line. The "Comments" section should not be used to indicate general language levels. The use of language codes for collections at level 3 or higher is encouraged so that potential assignments for primary collecting responsibilities can more easily be determined.

Language Coverage Codes

E - English language material predominates; little or no foreign language material in the collection.

F - Selected foreign language material included, in addition to the English language material.

W - Wide selection of foreign language material in all applicable languages.

Y - Material is primarily in one foreign language.

SELECTED PORTIONS

The Arizona State University Library

Collection Analysis Report

CAP Study Team:

Vladimir Borovansky
Eulalie Brown
Constance Corey
Jane Henning
Kay Jones
Elliot Palais
George Soete, Chair
Alice Conkright, Project Editor

Arizona State University

Tempe, Arizona

March 1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF TABLES		iii
LIST OF FIGURES		iv
PREFACE		v
CHAPTER		
I	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY	1
II	HISTORY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE LIBRARY'S COLLECTION	19
III	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	37
IV	THE LIBRARY'S ENVIRONMENT	43
TASK FORCE REPORTS		
V	COLLECTION ASSESSMENT	59
VI	COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT OPERATIONS AND PROCEDURES	95
VII	PRESERVATION	115
VIII	RESOURCE SHARING	137

It should be noted that interpreting and drawing conclusions from strictly quantitative data always requires the use of judgment: a title may have a high circulation for other than curricular reasons, or it may be used only within the Library. Thus, a research library collection cannot be limited only to items that circulate. Moreover, the subject assessed determines the importance of circulation figures--the most obvious difference occurring between Science and Humanities. Even so, concrete usage data have a real value and should continue to be included in future assessment efforts.

7. Bibliographic Checking. An almost universal method of assessment is to check holdings against an authoritative list. Depending upon the size and the appropriateness of the list selected, such a check may be randomly selected titles, or it may be a 100 percent check. The latter has the added value of immediately providing titles for purchase decisions and therefore may be preferable if a weak area is assessed. Unfortunately, in some areas, a good, up-to-date, authoritative list doesn't always exist, or if one does, it may have already been used for ordering, thus reducing its usefulness in an assessment. In those cases, it is necessary to use those lists which are available, keeping in mind their limitations when drawing conclusions.

B. Individual Assessments. Full reports were prepared for each of the four assessment areas: Art Periodicals, Microbiology, Spanish-American literature and Women's Studies. Only the highlights of the reports, with a focus on major findings and recommendations for the areas assessed, can be discussed below.

1. Art Periodicals

a. Statement of Purpose and Rationale. After consultation with appropriate faculty, it was decided that the adequacy of periodical subscriptions supporting the entire field of art rather than monograph and serial coverage within a narrow subfield would be assessed. Because of the existence of a separate Architecture Library, the NA classification is not considered in this study, nor, for other practical reasons, are titles outside the N-NX classification.

b. Departmental Description. This year's enrollment in Art Department courses at ASU includes 1,028 undergraduates majoring in Studio Art, 170 in Art Education, and 53 in Art History. In the Master's degree program, 68 are enrolled in Studio Art and 23 in Art History. Consideration is being given to an MFA degree requiring a written thesis as well as the usual exhibition of original work. A doctoral program is planned in three years, with new programs also to be designed and offered in art criticism and museum studies, and new material developed for Southwest Indian, Southwest regional and Islamic art. Also, there are many non-major undergraduate students enrolled in the art history courses, almost all of which require term papers.

c. Major Findings.

1) Indexes checked for ASU Library current subscriptions:

INDEXES	NO. TITLES INDEXED	NO. TITLES AT ASU LIBRARY	PERCENTAGE OF COVERAGE
A 100% sampling was taken of:			
Art & Archaeology Technical Abstracts, 13:2, Winter 1976	379	98	24
Art Design Photo	213	104	49
Artbibliographies Modern, list rec'd, 1977	309	160	51
Art Index, April 1976	150	123	82
RILA: Repertoire International de la Litterature de l'Art...	193	85	44
A 23% sampling was taken of:			
Bulletin Signaletique: Art et Archeologie, v.30, 1976	641	98	67
An 18% sampling was taken of:			
Repertoire d'Art et d'Archeologie v.13, no.1, n.s. 1977	1,499	156	58

Judging by one reference suggesting that 70 percent of indexed materials should be available in-house for research purposes, we have satisfactory coverage only for titles in the Art Index.[2]

[2]Norman Roberts and Gillian Bull. "Some Implications of the Trend in External Borrowing by University Libraries, 1960/61-1972/73," Journal of Librarianship, 8:165, July 1976, footnote 9.

The results of a more in-depth examination of three selected indexes were as follows:

INDEX	TITLES INDEXED	NA TITLES INDEXED	FOR. L. TITLES INDEXED	FOR. L. TITLES NOT AT ASU	ASU* HOLDINGS OF TITLES	ASU CURRENT SUB-SCRIPTIONS	PERCENTAGE OF COVERAGE
Art Index	150	28	35	19	95	84	68
Artbiblio. Modern	309	15	107	68	149	120	41
RILA	193	5	100	81	80	75	40

*ASU Holdings of Titles includes non-N classifications but not Na's.

2) Backfiles. The 180 art serials currently subscribed to were checked for completeness of holdings. Only 23 (13%) have no gaps. Thirty-one titles (17%) lack ten bound volumes or less; thus, the major weakness of the art periodical collection is the 70 percent of the titles with incomplete backfiles.

3) Study of Interlibrary Loan Requests. When examined for a recent two-year period, interlibrary loan requests from faculty and students in the Department of Art showed that over twice as many monographs as journals were requested; journal requests were characterized by a preponderance of older materials; and 31 percent of the requests were for foreign language publications.

The requests reflect the kind of materials needed for scholarly studies and research, and could serve as a guide in the acquisition of new serial titles, microcopies and reprint runs.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE PERIODICALS REQUESTED FROM INTERLIBRARY LOAN

French	42
Italian	14
German	16
Dutch	15
Spanish	5
	92
	(31%)

INTERLIBRARY LOANS OF ART PERIODICALS BY YEARS OF PUBLICATION

Pre-1900	116	
1900-1909	23	
1910-1919	24	87%
1920-1929	11	
1930-1939	23	
1940-1949	14	
1950-1959	49	
1960-1969	22	13%
1970-	17	
	299	

4) Inventory report. Missing volumes and mutilation of art periodicals in the general stacks obviously affect the availability of materials. The records of an inventory taken in November 1977 show 151 bound serial volumes (3.2%) missing from a total of 4,671 volumes. (1% probably showed up later.) Miscellaneous issues from 36 bound volumes had pages and/or pictures cut out.

5) Comparison with the Ohio State University Art Library. The holdings of Ohio State University's Art Library, as listed in Union List of Periodicals and Serials in Art Research Libraries,[3] were checked. In order to approximate our current holdings in the N - NX classification, titles obviously in architecture and anthropology were eliminated before a count was made of OSU Art Library's current subscriptions. OSU Art Library held approximately 400 subscriptions, or 55 percent more than ASU Library. OSU Library is a more mature library with about 60 percent more volumes, 50 percent more total subscriptions, and 58 percent more art books. However, only in current foreign language art subscriptions (and undoubtedly in back-files) did ASU Library not maintain roughly equivalent ratios with OSU Art Library; OSU had 78 percent more foreign language art subscriptions.

d. Additional Methodologies.

1) Analysis of Use of Art Periodicals in Current Periodicals Service. All art journals shelved in Current Periodicals Service were examined to determine how many times each title was used from January to November 1977. Use was defined as either use inside the CPS reading area or circulation over the counter. The table below is based on a study by William Goffman and Thomas Morris.[4]

NUMBER OF JOURNALS	CIRCULATION PER JOURNAL	NUMBER OF CIRCULATIONS
3	400 +	1,261
2	300 - 399	633
8	200 - 299	1,897
10	100 - 199	1,440
65	1 - 99	799
88		6,030

In addition to the 88 titles that circulated once or more, another 18 journals did not circulate at all.

[3](Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Libraries, 1974).

[4]"Bradford's Law and Library Acquisitions," Nature, 221:922, June 6, 1970.

As is obvious from the above table, use is concentrated on a relatively small number of titles: nine journals accounted for half of the circulation. Three titles are extraordinarily popular, each circulating over 400 times during the test period. Almost half of the collection (41 titles) circulated less than ten times, but only ten titles circulated just once.

All of the French and German titles circulated at least once, and two journals in each of those languages were widely-used (over 100 circulations each). As for journals in other languages, eight were not used at all, three were used once, and one was used three times.

Use of foreign language titles:

	NUMBER OF TITLES	NUMBER OF CIRCULATIONS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CIRCULATION
French	5	450	7.5
German	8	342	5.7
Other	17	32	.5

Care must be used in interpreting these data because of the brevity of the period covered. Also, the category of user and the user's purpose are inadequately identified.

2) Citation Analysis. A simplified attempt was made to test the effectiveness of citation analysis as a method of determining the composition of an art periodical collection. Recent single issues of two periodicals (Art Bulletin and Burlington Magazine) were chosen, and a close study was made of their footnotes to seek out some useful pattern of data. The pattern that emerged was one of references to two to three times as many monographs as serials; moreover, one-third to over one-half of the periodicals references were to foreign language journals, a pattern similar to ASU Library's interlibrary loan requests. ASU Library held 44 percent of the serial publications cited in the December 1976 issue of the Art Bulletin and 65 percent of those in the November 1977 issue of Burlington Magazine.

e. Recommendations

1) The acquisition of as many backfiles as are appropriate to increase the number of complete runs of current periodicals.

2) The selection of one or more indexes for emphasis in coverage of Art titles.

3) Attention to the needs of Studio Art majors in the form of judicious acquisition of some of the newer (and possibly short-run) serial publications in art.

4) Maintenance of the present level of foreign language art periodicals, with a gradual increase in titles to coincide with the development and maturity of graduate and doctoral programs.

5) Evaluation of titles and holdings of older or ceased periodicals, using Chamberlin's list of 250 periodicals in her Guide to Art Reference Books (1959). Acquisition of backfiles of more historical titles when available in reprints or microforms to increase the in-depth research capability of the collection.

6) The establishment of a system whereby Library users--particularly undergraduates who often do not have time to wait for intrastate interlibrary loan or Center for Research Libraries services--may report periodical titles not held in the Library as a guide to needs.

7) Initiation of an active program of consultation and cooperation with the University of Arizona and other art libraries in the state for the acquisition of new serial publications and the minimizing of unnecessary duplication of material.

2. Microbiology

a. Statement of Purpose and Rationale. Microbiology was chosen as an assessment area because the field is sufficiently narrow to use for a short term project, the literature use suggests a heavy reliance upon timely research reporting in non-monographic forms, and the academic program has doctoral programs, significant research, and a heavy enrollment of students. A decision was made to assess all LC categories in the collection pertaining to the Microbiology Department's program. Relevant LC classes were determined by use of the Golden model, which involves examining course descriptions in the University catalog and assigning appropriate LC class numbers (a maximum of three)under each course.[5] Class numbers were modified after discussion with faculty members to better reflect teaching and research. The resulting LC categories were then employed in the various methodologies that were tested.

b. Departmental Description. Trends in the Microbiology Department indicate increasing enrollment but no change either in the proportion of graduate students to undergraduates or the number of faculty members. Undergraduate enrollment totaled 269, and there were 27 graduate students and 10 faculty members in 1977.

c. Major Findings: Strengths and Weaknesses.

1) Results of Importance/Success Survey. This survey compares faculty perceptions of what materials are important with their perceptions of their success in locating and using these materials. Five categories were rated high in importance. Of these, the faculty registered

---

[5]Barbara Golden. "A Method for Quantitatively Evaluating a University Library Collection." Library Resources and Technical Services, 18(3): 268-274 (Summer 1974).

satisfaction only with "indexes to journals and periodicals." Varying degrees of dissatisfaction (-1 to -2.1) were indicated for the following types of materials: scholarly journals, materials published in the last five years, and materials used for the purpose of academic research or sponsored grant research.

Faculty members registered varying (positive) degrees of satisfaction (+0.5 to +1.2) with categories considered to be of least importance to them (i.e., general interest materials, and Romance, Slavic, Oriental, and Arabic language publications). These ratings correlate closely with opinions obtained from interviews and must be taken seriously as an indication of either inadequate or misplaced support.

2) Major Weaknesses in the Collection as Indicated by Interviews and Questionnaires. The following problems with the collection were identified: a) lack of journal titles, b) lack of backfiles of journals, and c) not enough symposiums and proceedings. Faculty members also admitted to a lack of knowledge about acquisitions procedures and the existence of Subject Specialist Librarians. Other collection-related problems concerned the excessive time required to obtain interlibrary loans; the inconvenience of using current science journals that are divided between the main library and the separately-housed Physical Science Reading Room; the length of time required to bind journals; and the need for a separate science library.

By contrast, students were more concerned with facilities than with resources, with the single exception of a perceived lack of sufficient copies of required reading materials. This response correlates with the results of the circulation analysis, which indicates that students have very low circulation ratios compared to faculty. Students are more troubled by poor copying service and the waiting time to check out books than by any weakness in resources.

3) Collection-Centered Assessment. Because definitive bibliographies do not exist for the microbiology field, the assessment team selected a variety of general medical and biological bibliographies, some of them highly specialized, and chose appropriate portions of each work to check against the catalog. The results of the bibliographic checking were as follows:

a) Monographs (results are divided into reference works and research materials). Of 304 reference titles checked, our holdings included 122 or 40 percent. Of the 304 titles, 142 were in microbiology; our holdings of these were 94 or 79 percent. We owned only 28 or 18 percent of the primarily medical works. These figures reflect ASU's lack of a medical school, with emphasis being placed on microbiology rather than clinical medicine.

Of 1262 research titles checked, we held 656 or 52 percent. Of the total sample, 1026 were in microbiology and we held 588 or 57 percent of these. Of the medical works, ASU Library held only 28 percent.

b) Serials. Out of 778 serials checked, our holdings reflected 179 or 23 percent. Of 168 titles published in English speaking countries, our holdings showed 133 or 79 percent; the remaining 11 percent were primarily foreign language titles. This concentration on English language journals is justified by citation studies that indicate little use of foreign microbiology titles.

4) Measures of Collection Use. Various measures of collection use were employed in an effort to identify weaknesses precisely:

a) Frequently circulated titles. Each year a list is generated of every title circulated five or more times, and added copies of such books are purchased to relieve pressure on extant copies and improve access. In the LC classes identified by the Golden model as microbiology, fifty titles circulated five or more times in 1976/1977. The access problem in microbiology appears to be small and easily solved by the Added Copy Project.

b) Intensity of use in Microbiology LC classes. The following analysis is based on a printout of every title circulated in the designated LC categories during a nine-month period. These figures were compared to the inch count of the shelf list for the same categories. A table was produced which shows both the number of titles circulated for each class and the percentage of that portion of the collection that was used. Areas receiving very heavy or very light use are easily identified in this manner. Areas in which 50 percent or more of the collection was used are as follows: Biochemistry; Microtechniques; Culturing/Diagnostic; Laboratory Methods; Immunology; Etiology of Disease; Infectious/Parasitic; Mycotic Disease; and Diseases.

c) Analysis of category of user. This analysis tests the assumption often made that the faculty tend to use periodicals, while students use monographs. Circulation statistics for the Q-QR categories were checked for a six-month period. Of the monographs in circulation at any given time, on an average, 98 were checked out to faculty; 73 to graduate students; and 106 to undergraduates. Using the figures given above for the number of individuals in each of the three categories of users, the following striking pattern of use is revealed: each faculty member has 9.8 titles checked out; each graduate student had 3 titles checked out; and each undergraduate has only .45 of a title. Accordingly, the profile of the average Library patron in microbiology is that of a faculty member or graduate student; i.e., a research worker. The microbiology collection, then, requires material which will suit the needs of research or professional people, and such material can be purchased with the assurance that it will be used.

d) Use of reserve collection. That undergraduate microbiology students do not make heavy use of the book collection is further demonstrated by a study made of the use of reserve books. In a six-month period, the total use of reserve books in microbiology was only 86. Of 24 titles on reserve, only 18 were used, on an average of 4.7 times per title. Considering all microbiology undergraduates, this is less than .4 volumes per student.

e) Periodical usage analysis. Microbiology periodicals were identified by comparing appropriate LC classes with the serials holdings file, which lists all serials held by the Library, whether currently received or not. Current titles were checked in Current Periodicals Service to record both over-the-counter and room use during a six-month period. Results indicate that 60 percent of the periodicals are used. Twenty-eight titles were not used at all, although if studied over a longer period of time, some titles might show more extensive use. Foreign language journals receive very little use. As a matter of fact, of the six microbiology titles totally written in foreign languages, none were used. High use in certain categories may indicate that additional journal titles in that field may be purchased with some assurance of higher-than-average use. In some cases, all current issues of a journal were used.

A test employing the technique of citation analysis provided compelling reasons for purchasing journals that are adequately indexed. For example, 76 percent of those journals indexed in Current Contents-Life Sciences were used, while only 26 percent of those not indexed were used. Similar results were obtained for the Science Citation Index List of 1000 Most Cited Journals: 67 percent of listed titles were used; only 35 percent of non-listed titles recorded any use.

d. Recommendations.

1) The Subject Specialist Librarian in Microbiology should identify and order needed scholarly journals, paying particular attention to English language titles, titles indexed in Current Contents, and titles in areas that receive intense use in Current Periodicals Service.

2) The Subject Specialist Librarian should identify and order needed primary research materials, particularly those published in the last five years. The results of bibliographical checking should be used as a guide to areas of weakness. Particular attention should be paid to fields receiving intensive circulation use.

3) The Subject Specialist Librarian should consult with faculty members assigning required readings to assure access to the small number of titles required by undergraduate microbiology students. With the exception of required readings, the selection of low-level materials should be severely limited.

4) The Subject Specialist Librarian should attempt to improve the availability of the most significant symposia and proceedings.

5) The Subject Specialist Librarian should identify and order backfiles of the more heavily-used journals.

6) The Subject Specialist Librarian should devise methods of communicating to the faculty information about acquisitions procedures and policies, as well as information about services provided by the Subject Specialist.

7) The Subject Specialist Librarian should administer the Importance/Success Survey annually to each category of user to detect a decrease in user satisfaction or changes in the importance of various categories of materials.

3. Spanish American Literature.

a. Statement of Purpose and Rationale. This area was selected for two major reasons: (1) faculty concern about collection strength in the areas of national literature of Mexico, West Indies (particularly Cuba and Puerto Rico because of a recently-developed curricular interest in those countries), Argentina, Chile and Peru; and (2) the Library's need to measure the efficiency of our approval plan with Mexico.

b. Department Description. The department lists twenty courses specifically related to Spanish American interests in literature. The program extends to the doctoral level. Eight faculty members teach in this area of Spanish; there are 206 students enrolled at the senior level and 63 students at the graduate level.

c. Major Findings.

1) Monographs. A profile of our holdings in each national area was made by counting our shelf list and arriving at a percentage dedicated to each country's literature. This profile was then compared to a similar treatment of the Widener Shelflist (see TABLE V-4).[6]

The areas where we rate above our standard and Widener's profile are, in decreasing order, Argentine literature, other South American literature, Mexican literature, General literature and Peruvian literature. The areas where we rate below our standard are, in increasing order, Puerto Rican literature, other West Indies literature, Chilean literature, literature of Central American and Cuban literature. The disproportion is very acute at the two extreme points of the spectrum: Argentine literature and Cuban literature.

a) Circulation Analysis. Circulation data for the period August 16, 1976 to May 28, 1977 were analyzed and compared to our profile of strong and weak areas, identified above, to isolate areas of strain (see TABLE V-5). The heaviest strain for both categories of titles circulated and volumes circulated is in two areas: General literature and Cuban literature.

The strain on the General literature collection should not come as a surprise: a higher ratio of students in general survey courses are likely to use the type of material found within this classification.

---

[6]Harvard University. Library. Latin American Literature. Widener Library Shelflist, No. 21 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969).

TABLE V-4

SHELFLIST COMPARATIVE STUDY

	SHELFLIST COUNT		PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL SPANISH AMERICAN COLLECTION		COLLECTION PROFILE
	ASU	WIDENER	ASU	WIDENER	WEAKNESS AND STRENGTH
General	484	586	5.1	4.4	+ 0.7
Mexico	1643	2092	17.4	15.7	+ 1.7
West Indies:					
Cuba	248	1698	2.6	12.7	-10.1
Puerto Rico	146	288	1.5	2.1	- 0.6
Others	36	176	0.03	1.3	- 1.3
Central America	428	988	4.5	7.4	- 2.9
South America:					
Argentina	3510	3498	37.1	26.0	+11.1
Chile	653	1212	6.9	9.0	- 2.1
Peru	473	630	5.0	4.7	+ 0.3
Others	1837	2175	19.4	16.3	+ 3.1
TOTAL	9458	13,343			

TABLE V-5

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COLLECTION PROFIL

	COLLECTION PROFILE (FROM TABLE V-1)		NO. TITLES IN SHELFLIST
Strong Areas	*Argentina	+11.1	3,510
	South America (others)	+ 3.1	1,837
	*Mexico	+ 1.7	1,643
	*General	+ 0.7	484
	*Peru	+ 0.3	473
Weak Areas	*Puerto Rico	- 0.6	146
	West Indies (others)	- 1.3	36
	*Chile	- 2.1	653
	Central America	- 2.9	428
	*Cuba	-10.1	248

*Subject areas directly related to teac

TABLE V-5

COLLECTION PROFILE AND CIRCULATION ANALYSIS

NO. TITLES IN SHELFLIST	NO. TITLES CIRCULATED	USAGE BY TITLE PERCENTAGE	NO. VOLUMES CIRCULATED
3,510	220	6.2	384
1,837	131	7.1	169
1,643	199	12.1	315
484	132	27.7	229
473	108	22.8	177
146	9	6.2	15
36	1	2.7	1
653	99	15.2	204
428	51	11.9	66
248	67	27.0	108

related to teaching and research.

Particularly, the circulation per volume indicates a definite need for development of that part of the collection in terms of added copies. The strain on our Cuban literature collection is explained by the weakness of our collection in that area.

Within the other special areas currently taught, Chile and Peru, followed by Mexico and Puerto Rico, show a higher need for development both in added copies and depth of coverage. Argentine literature shows a very low circulation pattern. The emphasis placed in this area in the past, however valid in terms of collection development, is apparently out of proportion with current demand, when compared with the rest of the collection. The results of retrospective bibliographic checking in selected areas are as follows:

	NO. TITLES CHECKED	NO. TITLES ASU HAS	ASU HOLDINGS AS PERCENTAGE OF ITEMS CHECKED
Reference Material:	452	344	76.1
General literature:	636	328	51.6
Twentieth-century Mexican literature:	723	407	56.3
Total	1,811	1,079	59.6

Our holdings in reference material appear relatively fair. A qualitative analysis of the titles we do not own would give us a more precise profile of our strong and weak areas in reference materials. In general literature and twentieth-century Mexican literature, our collection appears weaker. The difference in percentages between our comparative inch-count measurement and the results of our bibliographical checking might raise some questions about the quality of our collection.

b) Current Monographs, Bibliographic Checking in Selected Areas. A list of titles from Library of Congress subject catalogs (1973-) was compiled using appropriate subject headings in the areas of general Spanish American literature, and general and twentieth-century Mexican literature; ASU Library's general criteria for collection development in the field of literature was applied. This list was then checked against our card catalog. Of 146 titles, we owned 102 or 69.9 percent. The titles which we did not own were analyzed by place of publication and language. We appear fairly successful in acquiring material published in Mexico (55 titles out of 68, or an 80.9 percent success rate). We appear less than successful in acquiring material in the Spanish language published in this country (four titles out of eleven, or a 36.3 percent success rate). We appear unsuccessful in acquiring material in Romance languages other than Spanish (one title out of seven, or a 12.5 percent success rate). It is not possible to verify whether our approval plan or a direct order is the means of acquisition for the titles we own.

c) Approval Plan Statistics. The statistics on our approval plan with Latin America were available only for the last two years, between July 1975 and July 1977. Interpreted in light of our needs, they seem to show an overabundance of material in creative literature in subject areas not directly connected with our program. They also seem to show a disproportionate quantity of creative literature versus literary history and criticism.

	*Argentina	Bolivia	*Chile	Columbia	*Mexico	*Peru	Total
Creative Writing	185	13	88	158	121	82	647
History & Criticism	47	3	11	19	22	18	120
Total	232	16	99	177	143	100	767

*Countries for which we have a specific program in the field of literature.

2) Journals.

a) Bibliographic Checking.

(1) Bleznick, "Major Journals in the Hispanic Field," excluding titles dealing exclusively with linguistics and peninsular literature. We own 50 of the 68 titles listed in Bleznick, or 73.5 percent. Twenty-four of these are complete holdings; 26 are incomplete.

(2) Year's Work in Modern Languages, 1972-75, in twentieth-century general literature and twentieth-century literature of Mexico, Cuba and Puerto Rico, Argentina, Chile and Peru. A systematic count of articles in the chapters devoted to these areas provided us with a list of 102 journals and a total number of 715 citations. By adapting Bradford's Law of zones and cores to these results, we were able to divide our list as follows:[7]

Zone I: 233 articles in 4 journals.

Zone II: 247 articles in 15 journals.

Zone III: 235 articles in 83 journals.

The journals in Zone I were determined as "most relevant" to our subject, the journals in Zone II as "less relevant," and the journals in Zone III as "least relevant." By checking the titles in each zone against our Public Serials

---

[7]Goffman, William and Thomas G. Morris. "Bradford's Law and Library Acquisitions," Nature, 226:922-23, June 6, 1970.

List, we were able to determine that our holdings covered 70.3 percent of the total number of citations:

		PERCENTAGE OF EFFICIENCY
Zone I:	We hold all the articles in that category	100
Zone II:	We hold 141 of 247 articles	57.1
Zone III:	We hold 129 of 235 articles	54.9

This method enabled us to identify five journals in Zone II that we currently lack. By adding those journals, we would increase our potential success rate by 15 percent.

b) Circulation Analysis: Current Journals (1975-77). The list of the 27 journals for which circulation data were gathered was a combination of the journals we own in Bleznick's list, the titles identified in shelf-reading, and the titles included in Zones I and II of our citation analysis. In addition, we extended our study to journals in Zone III which were classified in the PC 4000 and within the PQ 6000-8000 schedules.

Our total number of transactions, in the reading room and over the counter, was 710. All journals were used, some rather heavily. Only ten journals were used less than ten times, and of those, three were used only once.

By adapting Bradford's Law of zones and cores to these results. we were able to divide our list as follows:

Zone I: 240 transactions in 3 journals

Zone II: 243 transactions in 6 journals

Zone III: 227 transactions in 20 journals

An attempt was made to correlate the zones identified in the two methods--citation analysis and circulation. Few correlations were apparent.

d. Recommendations. On the basis of our findings, our long-range recommendations are as follows:

1) To study the feasibility of implementing more aggressive acquisition programs in the area of Cuban literature for both current and retrospective material.

2) To step up our acquisition of selected O.P. material in our weak areas, with priority in the areas of higher use, by creating contacts with book dealers who specialize in those areas and working from

our established want lists.

3) To refine our approval plans in the area of creative literature and make the inventory of "what we do not receive on approval plans" an integral part of our approval plan monitoring.

These measures should be taken in collaboration with the Foreign Language Department and the Library Acquisitions Service.

Immediately, we recommend the continuation of student help to assist in tying up the loose ends of our study in areas where lack of time prevented us from verifying our findings and to aid in processing orders for material identified as needed in the course of our assessment.

4. Women's Studies.

a. Background of the Women's Studies Program. The Women's Studies Program was officially established in the fall semester, 1977. The director of the program, a member of the English Department faculty, works in conjunction with the newly-formed Women's Studies Advisory Committee. The Subject Specialist Librarian for Women's Studies is a member of this committee. The program is an interdisciplinary one and cannot be declared as a major or a minor. A proposal for a certificate of concentration in Women's Studies is being considered by the Board of Regents, and it is expected that students will be eligible for this certificate in May 1978.

Courses from several colleges are designated as Women's Studies by the director and the advisory committee. During the fall semester, 1977, twelve such courses were offered: . two in Secondary Education, one in Art Education, four in Humanities and Religion, one in English, one in History, one in Law, three in Nursing, and two in interdisciplinary Liberal Arts. The total enrollment in these courses was 411.

In addition, there are related Women's Studies courses. In the fall semester, 1977, thirteen of these were offered: in the fields of marriage and the family, sexuality, minorities, myths, and communication. Total enrollment for these courses was 1,687. For such courses to be accepted for the certificate of concentration, the student must petition the advisory committee. Two other courses were offered in this area: "Womankind," a television course, and "Women in Management," offered by the Center for Executive Development. Enrollment in these courses was 127. The grand total for enrollment in all related courses was 2,230.

There are 34 faculty members associated with the program.

b. Major Findings: Strengths and Weaknesses of the Women's Studies Collection.

1) Collection Development Activities. Faculty perceive a weakness in the Baker & Taylor Approval Program. Two areas specifically

mentioned were Music and Biography. Other comments suggest that there is a legitimate need for popular works because counselors and social workers must be aware of such material. There was general agreement that greater communication among faculty, the Departmental Library Representative, and the Subject Specialist Librarian was needed, and their respective roles in collection development needed clarification. Nevertheless, most faculty feel the existing arrangement is satisfactory. Although the Subject Specialist Librarian should have authority to initiate requests, faculty feel that they must have a role in weeding so that significant materials will not be discarded.

2) Collection-Centered Assessment: Checking of Bibliographies. A total of nine bibliographies were checked against our holdings (100 percent of each bibliography). Of the total number of items checked (2,112), the University Library lacked only 363 or 17.2 percent. Our best score was for Books for College Libraries (lacked only 7.4 percent) and our worst for Women and Psychology (lacked 37.1 percent).

3) Availability of Resources. Most of the faculty members surveyed felt that they are hampered in their research to some degree by lack of resources. Biography was identified as a particularly weak area by one faculty member. Taped and filmed interviews were also mentioned, although there has been no effort to collect this kind of material. Another indication of weakness was the response of 37 percent of the students surveyed that the books they look for are often not owned by the Library. Ten out of twelve women faculty interviewed replied that the reason they failed to locate needed material was that the Library did not own it.

4) Accessibility. Even when the Library owns a title, gaining access to it is a problem in the Women's Studies area. Responses from surveys indicate that significant reasons for not finding material were "materials checked out" or "materials not on shelf." Eighty-six percent of students answering a questionnaire replied that the book they wanted was often not on the shelf, and 64 percent replied that the book was often checked out. This problem is so severe that many faculty members and students rely heavily on collections outside the University Library, such as the one maintained in the Women's Studies Office, and personal collections in homes and offices. Faculty members possessing such collections often lend material to students.

Reasons for the access problem experienced by users of the Women's Studies collection can be presented in statistical form. For example, a large number of titles in the HQ's circulate frequently, as indicated by the Circulation Analysis Report which reports titles that circulated five or more times in a two-semester period. There were 350 such titles (7.9 percent of the total circulating collection) in 1976/77, and these books must have been in circulation most of the time.

Another measure of access problems is the number of holds placed on books. Seventy-one different books had holds placed on them between October 12 and December 16, 1977. Ten of these had a second or even a third hold placed. Because few patrons go to the trouble of filling out

hold requests, the total demand for these books must be much greater.

According to the Circulation by Class Report, 2,983 titles in the HQ class circulated during the fall semester, 1977. This number represents 67 percent of the circulating collection in this area (compared to an average of 25 percent for all classes combined), a percentage that proves the demand in this subject is extraordinarily high.

The number of HQ titles in circulation on two separate days was sampled as a measure of use. On the first day, 18.7 percent of the collection was in circulation; on the second day, later in the semester, 28 percent was circulating. On any particular day, therefore, a significant portion of the collection is not available for examination.

Similar evidence for heavy demand may be found in an analysis of circulation data for the fall and spring semesters, 1976/1977, using a management report that indicates every circulation transaction. According to this measure, the percentage of the circulating collection that actually circulated ranged from 30 percent to 86 percent. Of seven subclasses within HQ, only one recorded 30 percent; the others ranged from 64 percent to 86 percent.

The data presented above reinforce opinions expressed in faculty interviews and student questionnaires that the HQ collection is understocked in relation to the demands placed upon it. For example, the Faculty Importance/Success Survey recorded a negative (-1.6) degree of success in consulting or borrowing material for the purpose of academic research and -1.9 for consulting or borrowing books.

5) Interlibrary Loan and Resource Sharing. The Faculty Importance/Success Survey indicates that the faculty place a high value on interlibrary loans, yet are generally discouraged and frustrated by the Interlibrary Loan Service. Interlibrary loans are seen as a satisfactory alternative to purchase only if the service is both free and rapid, and if the loan period is extended. The faculty surveyed felt that fees for photocopying should not be charged to the requester because it is the University's responsibility to provide the material.

A study of interlibrary loan requests for a one-year period (July 1976 through June 1977) showed that, out of a total of 9,162 requests, 201 (2.2 percent) were for Women's Studies materials. Eighty-seven of the 201 requests were for foreign language articles and books. One art student accounted for ninety-six of the 201 requests. Other Women's Studies subjects were as follows (in declining order): Literature, Psychology, Sociology, History, Abortion and Birth Control, Science and Medicine, and Education. This investigation does indicate some areas of weakness in the collection.

Although faculty understand the rationale for resource sharing, their responses were generally negative. This attitude is partly due to lack of information on materials available elsewhere; for example,

few knew that the University of Arizona purchased the History of Women on Microfilm and the Herstory collection. They also deplore the loss of ability to browse. When they were given the alternative of remote access or no access at all, the faculty endorsed cooperative buying, including Center for Research Libraries purchases, but they stressed that real planning for resource sharing is needed.

c. Recommendations.

1) Added copies should be purchased of high demand items. Evidence presented in this report of severe access problems justifies an intensive program to supply added copies in this area.

2) Retrospective materials on Women's Studies should be systematically purchased. A new and expanding program requires a fully developed collection for teaching and research purposes.

3) The Baker & Taylor Approval Program should be supplemented by additional purchasing to assure availability of required materials, including both scholarly and popular works.

4) Communication with Women's Studies faculty regarding resource sharing should be improved.

5) Circulation Service should speed up the reshelving of books in areas of demonstrated high use.

IV. The Student Library User Survey

The Student Library User Survey was conducted in the Library lobby between 8 a.m. and 10 p.m. for a two-day period, November 29-30. The intent of the survey was not to achieve a random sampling, representative of the University at large, but rather to achieve as complete a picture as possible of the opinions and perceptions of those students actually using the Library on those two days. It is highly probable that those students who took the time to complete the one-page survey were, in fact, our most regular patrons, since they would have the greatest vested interest in identifying problems and suggesting changes. This probability is borne out by the high percentage (47.6%) of students who stated that they used the Library more than once a week. Only .7 percent said that it was their first visit.

STUDENT USER PROFILE: BY PERCENTAGE

BY CLASS	Freshmen	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate
	14.3	15.6	24	26	19.8
BY COLLEGE	Business	Education	Engineering	Fine Arts	Liberal Arts
	24.6	11.7	9.8	8.8	32.8

COLLECTION ASSESSMENT MANUAL

Blaine H. Hall

Harold B. Lee Library
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah
1981

INTRODUCTION

Carefully planned collection assessments can tell us both how we are doing in achieving our collection goals and how well we are meeting the collection needs of our patrons. This manual is designed to help bibliographers, subject librarians and other materials selectors plan and carry out a systematic collection assessment. Since no one measurement technique or group of techniques can be established for assessing all collections, the manual (1) outlines a procedure for formulating an assessment plan or methodology; (2) discusses a variety of measurement techniques from which the assessor may select to achieve specific assessment objectives; (3) provides a step by step procedure for applying the techniques; and (4) suggests ways to interpret and report the data. Included also are several appendixes that give additional information helpful to the assessor, such as random number tables and other statistical aids, copies of some of the articles referred to in the text, and a list of additional readings.

Assessing library collections, of course, can be a complex process, requiring a variety of tools and a certain amount of expertise, but a conscientious application of the measurement techniques and procedures in this manual will enable even the most inexperienced assessor to conduct a systematic evaluation of collection strengths and weaknesses.

The assessor should keep constantly in mind that measurement is not an end in itself. The measuring is done to provide data for more effective collection development decision making. Indeed, measurement for decision making is the basic premise on which the Lee Library assessment program is founded. An ongoing assessment program will provide a rational basis for needed changes in the library's collection program.

Appended to the manual are copies of several key articles on collection assessments that review the literature; provide a theoretical, philosophical, or pratical overview; and outline and discuss the application of various methods of measuring collection strength, weaknesses, and use, including one or two methods not discussed in the manual. Assessors desiring more information are encouraged to consult Appendix E.

The manual in its present loose-leaf form is not complete and should be considered a preliminary model. The librarians who use it are asked to provide criticisms, suggestions for additions or deletions, and information as to the time and effort required to implement the various techniques. Through this input revisions can be made to make it more useful and complete.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	Planning the Assessment	1.1
II.	Collection-Centered Techniques	2.1
	Compiling Statistics	2.1
	Gross Size	2.2
	Volumes Added and Percent of Growth	2.3
	Future Statistical Measurement Possibilities	2.4
	Checking Lists, Catalogs, Bibliographies	2.4
	Direct Observation of Collections	2.8
	Applying Standards	2.9
	Northwest Association Standards	2.10
	Professional Association Standards	2.12
III.	Client-Centered Techniques	3.1
	Availability and Accessibility	3.1
	Document Delivery Capability	3.2
	Availability Measures	3.8
	Accessibility Measures	3.16
	Measurement of Effort by Simulation (MAC-SIM)	3.16
	Measurement of Access Delay (MAC-DEL)	3.17
	User Surveys	3.21
	Other Utilization Measures	3.27
	Periodical Use Study	3.27
	Periodical Sample Program	3.29
	Circulation Studies	3.30
IV.	Specialized Assessments	4.1
	Assessments for Weeding Decisions	4.1
	Assessment of Approval Programs	4.6
V.	Reporting Assessment Results	5.1
	Example A, Accreditation Report of Lee Library Education Collection	5.3
	Example B, Organic Chemistry Collection	5.28
	Example C, SUL Collection Development Office Collection Evaluation Summary	5.33
Appendixes		
A.	Agencies Accrediting Programs at BYU	A.1
B.	ALA Standards for University Libraries	B.1
C.	Statistical Aids	C.1
	Sampling	C.1
	Determining Sample Size	C.2
	Sampling Techniques	C.2
	Selecting Random Numbers	C.10
D.	Selected Sources on Collection Assessments	D.1
E.	Copies of Selected Sources on Collection Assessments	E.1

CHAPTER I

PLANNING THE ASSESSMENT

Only through careful planning can a collection assessment be systematic and thorough enough to produce accurate and reliable data. In planning such an assessment, the assessor should keep in mind five basic premises:

1. Assessments are to be conducted to obtain data for more effective collection development decisions.

2. Assessments should consider how well collections are meeting the needs of users, both present and potential.

3. Assessments must be based on a current, clearly stated collection development policy statement for the collection being assessed.

4. Clear-cut, written objectives or outcomes to be achieved by the assessment must be formulated.

5. Subjectivity of judgment as to collection quality or adequacy can be reduced by a careful selection of both collection-centered and client-centered measurement techniques.

The Lee Library, as a result of the Collection Analysis Project (CAP), has undertaken a program to improve its collection development program. Important ingredients of this program are (1) to evaluate the success of previous collection efforts, (2) to monitor its ongoing program, and (3) to provide empirical data for establishing priorities and allocating its resources to achieve its collection goals and objectives.

In a library rapidly approaching two million volumes, this evaluation can only be accomplished through careful planning over several years. Assessments will be coordinated by the Assistant Collection Development Librarian, who will be responsible for administering the library assessment program. All subject librarians and other materials selectors will be expected to perform collection assessments as part of their collection development responsibilities but must have the assessment coordinator's approval before the project begins. Having obtained preliminary approval for a projected assessment, the subject librarian should formulate an assessment methodology using the form at the end of this chapter. This should then be submitted to the Assistant Collection Development Librarian for final approval.

PROCEDURE

1. Select the collection or part of the collection to be assessed.

Some considerations to keep in mind in selecting the area(s) to be assessed are:

a. The size of the collection and the time and resources available to perform the assessment.

b. Faculty or department interested in the collection.

c. Accreditation requirements of the department or college. (See Appendix A for a preliminary list of university programs presently accredited and requiring periodic review.)

d. Growing, declining, or changing curriculum and research programs.

e. Complaints from users or the awareness of other problems or concerns about a collection.

f. Commitments to consortiums for information about collections.

You should also try to develop a long-term schedule and time-table for assessing the various collections you are responsible for to assure that university, library, and personal priorities are met.

2. Review the collection policy statement for the collection to be assessed.

The review should assure that policy statements reflect the current status of the following:

a. The collecting level for the collection.

b. Curricular and research programs served by the collection.

c. Types and levels of materials acquired.

d. Language, chronological periods, and geographical focus of materials acquired.

e. Degree of overlap or cross-disciplinary use of the collection.

f. Any cooperative agreements that might significantly affect the level of collection development.

This policy review is important because the data obtained from collection measurements can only be interpreted in terms of the

collection purposes. Keep in mind, also, that while an assessment can provide data to help review collection policy statements, this does not eliminate the need to begin the assessment with as clear and current a policy as possible.

3. Determine the objectives to be achieved by the assessment.

The objectives for a collection assessment may vary considerably from librarian to librarian or collection to collection depending on (a) the time available, (b) the size of the collection, (c) the time elapsed since a prior assessment, (d) the purpose of the assessment (accreditation, changes in curriculum or research needs, justification for budget allocations, etc.) and (e) the kind of information needed about the collection or its use by patrons. But you must develop written objectives so you know what kinds of information you will need to obtain. Knowing this, you can then more purposefully select the measurement techniques and plan their application to provide the needed data.

Some of the objectives may be general, i.e.

(a) To learn more about the library science collection, its strengths and weaknesses.

(b) To provide information on which to build plans and specific recommendations to improve the library support to the Organic Chemistry Collection.

(c) To obtain data for revising the collection development policy for the Science Fiction Collection.

For an overall assessment of a collection, objectives stated at this level of generality would be appropriate, provided they are supported by more specific questions to be answered by the assessment. For example, general objective (c) above could be developed with the following specific questions:

Assessment Objectives for Science Fiction Collection

Overall Objective: To obtain data for revising the Science Fiction Collection Development Policy.

1. How adequate is the journal collection to meet patron needs?

2. Does the blanket order program profile provide the optimum materials needed in the collection?

3. Are there sufficient copies of heavily used titles?

4. Is the library obtaining adequate numbers of new titles to meet patron demands?

5. Are there changes in the curriculum that would require changes in the level of support the library should give the collection?

6. What is the availability and accessibility of the collection to patrons?

This example shows only a few of the possible questions that could be asked to provide a more precise statement of your assessment objectives.

But not all assessments need to be on such a complete scale to be useful. You may only need or want to measure one or two factors. You may only want to determine the adequacy or quality of a reference collection or of journals or of series or of recently published titles or of the primary works of one author. Or perhaps you just want to determine the shelf accessibility of materials in a collection or user opinions of the adequacy of a collection. But whatever your purpose, state it precisely and be sure it will provide useful data for more informed decision making.

The initital assessment of a collection would likely require a rather full and detailed measurement, but subsequent assessments may need only some follow-up measurement. The planning for subsequent assessments, therefore, should be based on the data and results obtained from previous measurements.

4. Select the measurement techniques to be used in the assessments.

Since Chapters 2 and 3 provide specific information about each of the measurement techniques, the procedures to use in their application, etc., this discussion will deal only with a few general consideration in selection measurement techniques.

Each technique has been developed to obtain certain kinds of information and must therefore be selected in terms of the objectives to be achieved. A shelf list measurement, for instance, can help you determine the gross size of a collection, but it cannot show you how accessible the collection is to patrons or how current and up to date the collection is. Nor does it tell you how good the collection is, even though we often assume that bigger is better. If your purpose is to measure the quality of the collection, you will obviously need to select other techniques, although gross size may be a good place to begin.

The important caution to keep in mind in selecting measuring devices is to select as many appropriate techniques as necessary to privide you with reliable information. You should in most instances plan to use both collection-centered and client-centered techniques. since each type approaches the measurement from a different point of view, used together they provide a check on each other. The former tends to focus on the adequacy of the collection for future patrons and the latter for present patrons. You will also need to keep in mind the time and other resources available. If these are limited, you may have to accomplish the assessment in stages over several years.

5. Estimate Resources Required.

Conducting assessments can be time consuming and require considerable clerical assistance for applying the various techniques. For this reason, you need to make fairly accurate estimates of the time and personnel required to conduct the assessment you are planning.

The following is the beginning of an estimation table that will be expanded as we gain more experience with various techniques and procedures. (The activities listed in the table are detailed in later chapters.)

Estimation Table

	Activity	Type of Person	Time
1.	Card catalog checking	Clerical	1 citation per minute
2.	Compiling sample title lists	Prof/Clerical	300 items, 15 hours
3.	MAC-DEL Test	Prof/Clerical	15 minutes per day
4.	MAC-SIM Test	Prof/Clerical	5 - 10 hours
5.	Availability Test	Prof/Clerical	50 hours
6.	Document Delivery Test	Prof/Clerical	4 - 10 hours
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			

Using these estimates and others of your own, determine as accurately as possible the resources you will need to carry out your planned assessment. Include these estimates in the appropriate places on the Collection Development Leave Proposal form (available from the Assistant Collection Development Librarian). Attach to this form the completed Assessment Planning Form (p. 1.6) and submit this assessment proposal to the Assistant Collection Development Librarian.

ASSESSMENT PLANNING FORM

Name_____ Application Date_____

Collection to be Assessed_____

Proposed Start Date_____ Proposed Completion Date_____

A. Purpose(s) to be achieved by the assessment. Be as specific as possible.

(Use additional pages if necessary.)

B. Measurement Techniques to be used and what each will contribute to the assessment.

1. Collection-centered.

2. Client-centered.

(Use additional pages if necessary.)

Approved_____ Date_____

SELECTED PORTIONS

Collection Effectiveness Task Force Report

UCSD LIBRARY

Submitted to the CAP Study Team By:

Bill Webb, Chair
Joanne Donovan
Pat Kinnison
Karen Lindvall
Phil Smith
Ulla Wohlleben

June, 1979

Table of Contents

Introduction 1.

Three Collection Assessment Studies 4.

- French Literature 6.
- Computer Science 9.
- U.S. History 13.

Four User Surveys 16.

- General User Survey 17.
- Graduate Student Survey 19.
- Faculty Surveys 21.

Other Collection Effectiveness Issues 27.

- Replacements 27.
- Added Copies 29.
- Faculty Document Delivery Service 32.
- Deselection and Storage 35.
- Guidelines for Bibliographers 37.
- Specialized Collections 40.

Appendices

- A - Collection Checks Done at UCSD 43.
- B - General User Survey Sample Form 46.
- C - General User Survey Results 47.
- D - Tabulations of Responses by UCSD Departments, Importance/Success Survey 48.
- E - Summary of Tabulations of Responses by UCSD Departments, Importance/Success Survey 60.
- F - Proposed Form for Collection Checks 63.
- G - Charge to the Task Force 64.

Three Collection Assessment Studies

The charge to the Task Force included the conducting of collection-oriented assessments, both to gain experience at a sampling methodology as well as to derive useable data. The three fields chosen were:

1) French Literature: Because this field has not been given the attention it needed, because of the availability of a dedicated graduate student, and because the bibliographer involved in selecting books for the subject was soon to retire, the Task Force chose to study this area. Moreover, some of the faculty and graduate students had expressed negative feelings about the library collection, and therefore could provide useful data for the user surveys.

2) Computer Science: This field was chosen because it is typical of cross-disciplinary and cross-library (Science and Engineering/Central University Library) subjects in which collecting responsibility is often ambiguous. Additionally, there has been faculty discontent with the quality of the collection.

3) U. S. History: The Library has invested heavily in this area, the faculty has been heavily involved, and its literature covers a broad range of materials.

In conducting a collection assessment, even in a very narrowly-defined field, the bibliographer is faced with two kinds of problems. First, there is the sheer bulk of the literature and the intellectual problem of how to screen a wide variety of bibliographic sources. Few fields possess a single, universally acknowledged "standard list." Good judgment by the bibliographer is called for; consultation

with the faculty in deciding upon which of several possible bibliographies to screen is also required.

The second problem is that of time. The practicing bibliographer does not have the time or sufficient student-assistant hours to do extensive bibliographic checking. A sampling methodology is called for. The Task Force chose therefore to demonstrate the applicability of small sampling sizes in collection assessments. Unless a list is being checked specifically for the purpose of purchasing the missing titles, we suggest that a five to twenty-five percent sample check yields as much useful information as a 100 percent check, and at only a fraction of the cost in staff time. A useful guideline is to do a 5% sample on a list of more than 1000 titles; a 10% sample for 500-1000 titles; and up to a 20-25% sample for lists smaller than 500 titles.

In conducting the collection assessments, precise times were logged by a well-trained, experienced student assistant for the major portion of the three collection assessments. A total of 976 titles were searched in 1,285 minutes, for an aggregate total of nearly 21½ hours of search time. The average time spent was 1.316 minutes per title. Of course, some lists can be searched more quickly than others: straight alphabetical lists obviously can be done most efficiently. In our study, alphabetical serial lists ranged from a low of .62 minutes per title to a high of 1.29 minutes per title, including searches in the In-Process file. Thus, from our experience we infer that a generalized time factor of 1.3 minutes per title can be considered a "standard time" for a mix of alphabetical and non-alphabetical searching of both serials and monographs, and we suggest

that this figure be used as a rule of thumb in estimating the staff time for such searching.

French Literature Collection Assessment

Description

The French literature collection aims to be fairly comprehensive, although there is no written selection policy for it. The medieval through the 16th-century periods have been slighted somewhat in retrospective collection building, though current publications seem to be acquired. The Department stresses the 17th and 18th centuries, 19th century romanticism and realism, and all aspects of the 20th century. The microfilm collection, French Books Before 1601 will, when completed, provide a substantial collection of early French texts.

The gaps in the collection are due to its longtime stepchild status. No bibliographer has ever been given the time and funds to build the collection seriously. A principal added factor is the troubled history of approval plans for French books. From 1966 to 1970 a Paris book dealer, Blancheteau, sent books on approval; the plan apparently started well but declined miserably by the end. In 1970, the Richard Abel Co. took over, giving what seemed no more than adequate coverage, declining to complete failure as the company's collapse neared in 1974-75. In March 1975 the Library arranged with Dr. George Vasco, collection development librarian at SUNY Stony Brook, to supply French books on approval. Dr. Vasco's field is French Literature, and since he is engaged in collection building at a "new campus" not too dissimilar from ours, the plan

seems to fit better with what we wish to achieve and appears to be consistently better than the previous ones.

Further, only one faculty member has shown any interest in the collection and that for only a short time; other faculty members don't use the library very much but rely on their own personal collections. The Department has become quite interdisciplinary and depends on other collections to a great extent, i.e., Philosophy, History, Psychology, Sociology, and has specialized in new and small areas such as Semiotics and Marxism.

Assessment

1) The French Review was selected to be the bibliographic source for assessing the French literature collection; it is the official journal of and is published by the American Association of Teachers of French, and it reviews books in the following areas: literary history and criticism, civilization, textbooks and methodology, film, linguistics and creative works. These monographs are in English as well as French, and all time periods and genres of French literature are represented.

The cumulated, single-alphabet book review index at the back of alternate volumes was searched for the time span 1953-1978 (vols. 27-51). Of 2,673 reviews, every 10th title was searched.

The results are as follows:

Total number of books reviewed: 2,673
Searched approximately 10%: 280 titles
Time Spent: 7 hours, 55 minutes (1.69 min. each)
Library has 140 out of 280 titles searched (50%)
In-Process: 13 titles, or 4.64%
In the first 12 years, library has 49.73%
In the last 12 years, library has 42.25%
In the first 12 years, an average of 102 titles were reviewed annually
In the last 12 years, an average of 342 titles were reviewed annually

2) French Literary Journals, A Selected Annotated Guide, published by the Library of the University of California, Berkeley, in 1977 was used to check journal holdings. This list of 265 titles is arranged by century; all titles, rather than a sample, were searched. The student assistant was further instructed to indicate whether or not the UCSD holdings were "complete or nearly so," "less than half complete," or "completely lacking." The results are as follows:

Titles Searched: 265 (100%)
Time Spent: 2 hours, 45 minutes (.62 min. each)

Holdings:	Complete	Partial	Lack
17th C:	2	1	1
18th C:	2	2	20
19th C:	7	2	69
20th C:	44	28	87
Total:	55 (20.75%)	33 (12.45%)	177 (66.79%)

Analysis

The findings indicate that the Library owns only half of the books and one-third of the journals published in the field of French literature. It is not known whether the results of this survey show the UCSD Library to have poor, adequate or good holdings vs. other institutions with libraries and French literature programs of comparable size. Significant gaps no doubt exist, and the Task Force suggests that this collection needs further systematic examination, beginning with specific areas in which cooperative faculty can be found.

The newly-appointed bibliographer for French literature must thus determine what is actually needed for current teaching and research by the interested faculty before any purchasing can be done. Two faculty members have already expressed an interest in working with the librarian: one in the comparative literature field is researching 20th century poetry; the other is a recent arrival on the campus and works in the 16th-18th century period. The Task Force suggests that this project begin as soon as possible so as not to lose the momentum of raised expectations by these faculty members, particularly because this is a department with a history of poor communication with the library.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1: THE FRENCH LITERATURE BIBLIOGRAPHER SHALL, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, REVIEW ALL FRENCH DEPARTMENT COURSE DESCRIPTIONS AND READING LISTS AND CONSULT WITH THE FACULTY, IN ORDER TO DETERMINE WITH AS MUCH PRECISION AS POSSIBLE THE ACTUAL TEACHING AND RESEARCH NEEDS IN THE DEPARTMENT, WITH A VIEW TOWARD DEFINING THE DESIRED SCOPE AND DEPTH OF THE COLLECTION.

Computer Science Collection Assessment

Description

The UCSD program in computer science was until recently identified by the descriptor, "Applied Physics and Information Science." During the Spring 1979 Quarter, the name of the department was officially changed to "Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences," thus marking publicly a direction the department has been following for some time. In the Library, there has been a perceived problem of inter-branch duplication -- of both effort and materials. Some of this duplication is inevitable because of the interdisciplinary nature of the field, but the Task

Force believes this problem of "fuzziness" to be compounded both by the Library's relatively artificial split between the Science & Engineering Library and the Central University Library as well as by the lack of a written collection policy for the field of computer science. Finally, the faculty have expressed discontent over the Library's collection, especially in the area of periodicals and particularly in the slowness with which new titles are acquired.

Assessment

1) In consultation with a faculty member, the Science & Engineering Librarian judged Computer and Control, an abstracting journal, to have the best short list of journals central to the teaching and research needs of the department at UCSD. A 25% sample check of the June 1978 list of "journals abstracted completely" was performed. The results are as follows:

Titles Searched: 89 out of 360 titles (25%)

Time Spent: 1 hour, 50 min. (1.29 minutes each)

S&E Holdings:	Complete	Partial	Lack	Only at SIO or Biomed
Number:	42	13	32	2
Percent:	47.2	14.6	36	2.2

Duplication: S&E and SIO: 17 titles (31%)
S&E and Biomed: 1 title (1.8%)
S&E and CUL: 1 title (1.8%)

2) Although the major literature emphasis in the computer science field is in journals, the Task Force recognized that students especially need books. Accordingly, the section labeled "Computer Science" in nineteen issues of Choice (October 1975 -- August 1977) was screened by a librarian. A total of sixty titles were thus identified as being English-language non-textbook monographs. Because of the small list, all titles were searched.

The results are as follows:

Titles Searched: 60 (pre-selected)
Time Spent: 2 hours, 15 minutes (2.25 min. each)
Library has 34 out of 60 titles (56.7%)
3 of these 34 titles are available only through the In-Process file (8.8%)
Duplication: S&E and SIO: 2 titles (5.9%)
S&E and CUL: 6 titles (17.6%)
S&E and Cluster: 4 titles (11.8%)
Not at S&E, but at other locations: 6 titles (17.6%)

Analysis

The faculty and students working in computer science have for some time expressed dissatisfaction with both the number of journal subscriptions and the great delays which they experience in ordering new journal titles. (See further the User Surveys in this Report.) This study demonstrated that the Library subscribes to nearly two-thirds of the appropriate journals in the field, and owns slightly more than half the monographs published. The Task Force suggests that even this high proportion (relative to the other two fields assessed in this Report) may not be adequate.

Further analysis of the journal titles which UCSD lacks reveals the country of origin of the missing 32 titles:

USA: 10 titles (31.25%)
Great Britain: 4 titles (12.5%)
Germany: 4 titles (12.5%)
Japan: 3 titles (9.37%)
9 Other Countries: 11 titles (34.37%)

A further aspect of the journal collection which needs exploration is the enormous duplication of titles between S&E and SIO (31%). The Task Force was surprised by this finding and suggests that this is in need of review. The Task Force recommends neither a specific percentage of duplication nor a specific percentage of journals abstracted in Computer and Control.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2: THE S&E LIBRARIAN SHALL, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, REVIEW ALL COMPUTER SCIENCE DEPARTMENT COURSE DESCRIPTIONS AND READING LISTS, AND SHALL REVIEW ALL CURRENTLY-RECEIVED SERIAL TITLES IN THE FIELD OF COMPUTER SCIENCE WITH ALL CONCERNED FACULTY AND STUDENTS, INCLUDING THOSE AT SIO, FOR THE PURPOSE OF CANCELLING UNWANTED TITLES, SUBSCRIBING TO ADDITIONAL COPIES OF NEEDED TITLES, AND BEGINNING SUBSCRIPTIONS TO NEW TITLES, AND WITH A VIEW TOWARD DEFINING THE SCOPE AND DEPTH OF THE COLLECTIONS.

Because the computer science field is more heavily dependent upon journal literature than monographic literature, the Task Force does not recommend an attempt to fill in any of the missing titles from the Choice list. On the contrary, the fact that the Library owns one-half the titles (56.7%) on that list may not be a meaningful reflection of the adequacy of the book collection because of the Department's reliance on other types of materials. Further, more than one-third (35.3%) of the monographic titles are duplicated in other campus libraries and 17.6% are available in locations other than the S&E Library. Thus, more than half the titles (52.9%) are located outside the S&E Library. The Task Force suggests that some review is needed.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3: THE S&E LIBRARIAN SHALL, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, REVIEW THE MONOGRAPHIC COLLECTION FOR RELEVANCE AND POSSIBLE DESELECTION; THE REVIEW PROCEDURES ARE TO BE DEVELOPED IN CONCERT WITH BIBLIOGRAPHERS AT SIO, CLUSTER AND CUL.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4: THE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT LIBRARIAN SHALL, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, BEGIN A REVIEW OF THE NEED FOR COMPUTER SCIENCE MATERIALS BEYOND THE SCOPE OF PARTICULAR DEPARTMENTAL INTERESTS IN ORDER TO ESTABLISH APPROPRIATE COLLECTING GUIDELINES. THIS REVIEW SHALL BE DONE IN CONCERT WITH THE BIBLIOGRAPHERS AT S&E, SIO, CLUSTER, BIOMED AND CUL.

U.S. History Collection Assessment

Description

The UCSD program in history concentrates -- at the Ph.D. level -- in European history, the Hispanic world, and U.S. history. Few academic disciplines exhibit the enormous breadth of literature as fully as historical studies; the library is the laboratory for the historian; the faculty have quite consistently involved themselves in the development of the collection; and the Library has invested enormous sums of money and staff time in the collection. The Task Force chose therefore to examine an area supposedly rich in resources in order to arrive at some generalizations about its efforts.

Assessment

1) The Task Force selected four sources in order to assess the adequacy of the Library's holdings in late 19th and 20th century U.S. history. Two chapters from the Harvard Guide to American History (Freidel, 1974) were chosen for assessment, Chapter 13, "Westward Expansion," and Chapter 25, "Intellectual History." Three of the Goldentree Bibliographies in American history were also selected: American Economic History Since 1869 (Kirkland, 1971), The Progressive Era and the Great War, 1896-1920 (Link, 1969), and American Diplomatic History Since 1890 (Fowler, 1975). The latter three have approximately

5,400 entries and are oriented toward the undergraduate level. A 5% sample was searched. The two Harvard Guide chapters have nearly 1,000 entries and are oriented toward upper-division and graduate level study. A 20% sample was searched.

The results are as follows:

Harvard Guide, ch. 13:	630 titles 125 entries searched (20%) Library has 93 (74.4%) Library lacks 32 (25.6%)
Harvard Guide, ch. 25:	335 titles 67 entries searched (20%) Library has 61 (91.5%) Library lacks 6 (8.9%)
Economic History Since 1869:	1200 titles 61 entries searched (5%) Time spent: 1 hr. 30 min. (1.47 min. each) Library has 50 (82%) Library lacks 11 (18%)
Diplomatic History Since 1890:	2870 titles 154 entries searched (5%) Time spent: 3 hr. 40 min. (1.43 min. each) Library has 137 (88.9%) Library lacks 17 (11%)
Progressive Era:	1300 titles 67 entries searched Time spent: 1 hr. 25 min. (1.27 min. each) Library has 60 (89.6%) Library lacks 7 (10.4%)

2) The abstract journals, America: History and Life and Historical Abstracts, represent a major portion of the scholarly historical work published world-wide in serial form. The "List of Periodicals" (1977) was used to assess the Library's holdings; it contains 2,947 periodical titles. Every title had been searched in the Fall of 1978 because of an earlier evaluation project, so the Task Force benefitted from this prior effort. No times, however, were recorded, and the

list inevitably covers much more than U.S. History.

The results are as follows:

Total number of titles:	2,947	
Library has:	1,012	(34.3%)
Library lacks:	1,935	(65.7%)

Of the 1,012 titles which the library has:

385 titles	(38%)	: D, E, F classification
153 titles	(15.1%)	: H classification
128 titles	(12.6%)	: A classification
64 titles	(6.3%)	: J, K classification
59 titles	(5.8%)	: P classification

Analysis

In this assessment of U.S. History monographic holdings, the library owns an overall average of 87.58% of the undergraduate-level titles, and 80.2% of the upper division titles. The test, of course, says nothing at all about faculty and graduate research needs. The Task Force concludes that the above figures may well demonstrate adequacy for student needs. User demand, as noted later in this report, suggests however a need for added copies of a number of titles (See Recommendation No. 17 later).

As for the journal collection, the Task Force can hardly avoid noting that two-thirds of the titles are not owned by the Library. It is doubtful that the Library can meet the minimum needs of historical scholarship with such a small base. Further, the Task Force notes the interdisciplinary complexity of the history field: only about one-third of the so-called "historical" journals are classified as such by the Library of Congress. This suggests caution in any deselection programs as well as in increasing the journals holdings.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5: THE BIBLIOGRAPHERS FOR HISTORY SHALL, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, REVIEW ALL HISTORY DEPARTMENT COURSE DESCRIPTIONS AND READING LISTS AND CONSULT WITH THE FACULTY WITH A VIEW TO DEFINING MORE PRECISELY THE SCOPE AND BREADTH OF THE HISTORICAL COLLECTIONS. THE PERCEIVED INADEQUACIES OF BOTH MONOGRAPHS (INSUFFICIENT COPIES) AND THE PERIODICALS (INSUFFICIENT TITLES) SHOULD BE THE FOCUS OF THE ABOVE ANALYSIS, AND THE BIBLIOGRAPHERS ARE PARTICULARLY CHARGED TO IDENTIFY POTENTIAL NEW SUBSCRIPTIONS AND THE DISCONTINUANCE OF EXISTING UNNECESSARY TITLES.

Four User Surveys

Introduction

The intent of this section of the Report is to assess the library's success in meeting current users' collection needs. Four surveys are presented, both as measures of the library's success and as instruments for future use. Because of time constraints, the Task Force has emphasized the development of the methodologies and tools in order to gain experience and, in effect, to pre-test the survey instruments.

An essential ingredient in collection effectiveness is the availability and accessibility of the library collection to the user. In response to its charge from the Study Team, the Task Force investigated current library processes for assessing systematically the collection's effectiveness. The Task Force found that, although user perceptions of library performance have been solicited through suggestion boxes and sporadic informal questioning, no recent large-scale user-oriented assessments of the library's performance have been done.*

The Task Force therefore chose to concentrate on surveys which

*The exceptionally useful user study of periodicals done by Beverlee French in Spring 1978 for the CUL Steering Committee is an example of a thorough, action-oriented specific study. Its merit is not reduced by its small scale or its specificity.

SELECTED PORTIONS

DEPAUW UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

SELF-STUDY REPORT

ASSISTED BY THE

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES
ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
MARCH 1982

DEPAUW UNIVERSITY
GREENCASTLE, INDIANA 46135

APPENDIX V BOOK USE STUDY

NOTE: the following material on the Book Use Study was sent to members of the Self-Study Committee, department chairs, and others. The information below was part of the cover letter.

As part of the library self-study this year we have examined the use of a one percent random sample of the library book collection. From a previous study sponsored by the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, such a sample has found to adequately represent the use of the total book collection. Members of the self-study team are meeting with various departments to share the results and to solicit suggestions.

Attached are the following items:

1. A table showing the number of books added and periodicals subscriptions over the past ten years and the cost of periodical subscriptions per year. This should give you some idea of the trend in this library and how little we actually do acquire in relation to what is available.

2. Six pages of general information from the book use study. Books were assigned to academic departments by call number. This is not an exact match with books purchased by each department, but from a previous study I found the match to be very close for most departments.

3. Two pages of information on "Books Uncirculated by Year of Acquisition." You will note from this random sample that 23.6% of the book collection has never circulated outside the libraries.

4. Seven pages on individual departments.

Larry Hardesty
Chairman of the Library
Self-Study Team

APPENDIX: 180

APPENDIX: 181

DePauw University

Book Use Study

January 1981

Department	# of Books/ Percent of All Books	Average Publication Date/Standard Deviation*	Median Publication Date/Standard Deviation	Average Acquisition Date/Standard Deviation
Art	51(3.2%)	1950(20 yrs.)	1953	1962(12.4 yrs.)
Botany	14(.9%)	1949(19.1 yrs.)	1949	1957(14.6 yrs.)
Chemistry	14(.9%)	1962(15.9 yrs.)	1967	1967(9.7 yrs.)
Classical Languages	90(5.7%)	1949(28.9 yrs.)	1961	1963(11.8 yrs.)
Communication Arts & Sciences	7(.4%)	1968(4.8 yrs.)	1966	1967(5.2 yrs.)
Earth Sciences	35(2.2%)	1955 (21.3 yrs.)	1962	1963(11.9 yrs.)
Economics	118(7.4%)	1960(19.7 yrs.)	1966	1964(12.8 yrs.)
Education	51(3.2%)	1960(15.3 yrs.)	1965	1965(10.9 yrs.)
English	245(15.4%)	1951(22.5 yrs.)	1958	1960(12.5 yrs.)
German & Russian	39(2.5%)	1953(24.2 yrs.)	1963	1961(12.9 yrs.)
History	265(16.7%)	1951(23.4 yrs.)	1959	1960(13.0 yrs.)
Math	40(2.5%)	1960(12.3 yrs.)	1963	1966(10.2 yrs.)
Music	46(2.9%)	1944(14.3 yrs.)	1947	1959(14.5 yrs.)
Philosophy & Religion	144(9.1%)	1948(29.1 yrs.)	1958	1962(12.5 yrs.)
Physical Ed.	9(.6%)	1956(15.4 yrs.)	1958	1960(13.3 yrs.)
Physics	23(1.4%)	1945(25.2 yrs.)	1958	1956(11.7 yrs.)
Political Science	80(5.0%)	1954(20.8 yrs.)	1959	1960(14.5 yrs.)
Psychology	23(1.4%)	1959(15.6 yrs.)	1963	1962(13.6 yrs.)
Romance Language	83(5.2%)	1953(19.4 yrs.)	1957	1962(12.4 yrs.)
Sociology & Anthropology	60(3.8%)	1959(14.9 yrs.)	1965	1963(11.7 yrs.)
Zoology	10(.6%)	1952(17.2 yrs.)	1950	1957(14.2 yrs.)
Other	140(8.8%)	1952(21.09 yrs.)	1950	1959(12.9 yrs.)
Totals	**1587	1952(22.6 yrs.)	1960	1961(12.7 yrs.)

* Approximately 2/3 of the books with one standard deviation each way from the mean (average)

** Approximately 1% random sample of DePauw University Libraries book collection January 1981 (55 books had unreadable or undeterminable circulation records)

Appendix: 182

Department	Median Acquisition Date	Average Last Circulation Date (Excluding Noncirculating Books)	Median Last Circulation Date (Excluding Noncirculating Books)	Number of Noncirculating Books
Art	1965	1976	1974	8
Botany	1961	1958	1959	5
Chemistry	1969	1973	1977	6
Classical Languages	1967	1964	1977	20
Communication Arts & Sciences	1965	1979	1980	1
Earth Sciences	1964	1975	1978	15
Economics	1967	1973	1977	25
Education	1967	1972	1976	11
English	1964	1973	1976	48
German & Russian	1966	1973	1974	12
History	1962	1973	1977	62
Math	1968	1976	1976	19
Music	1960	1975	1978	9
Philosophy & Religion	1964	1973	1976	33
Physical Education	1958	1970	1979	1
Physics	1960	1971	1976	11
Politial Science	1962	1972	1976	13
Psychology	1965	1976	1978	3
Romance Languages	1964	1971	1972	31
Sociology & Anthro.	1966	1976	1977	10
Zoology	1957	1974	1974	3
Other	1962	1973	1976	29
Totals	1964	1974	1976	375

Department	Noncirculating Books as Percent of Books Assigned to Department	Average Date of Publication of Noncirculating Books/Standard Deviation	Median Date of Publication ofNoncirculating Books
Art	15.6%	1946(27.4 yrs.)	1946
Botany	35.7%	1947(13.6 yrs.)	1949
Chemistry	42.8%	1968(7.0 yrs.)	1967
Classical Languages	22.2%	1948(37.9 yrs.)	1965
Communication Arts & Sciences	14.2%	1973--	1973
Earth Sciences	42.8%	1952(24.3 yrs.)	1964
Economics	21.2%	1959(30.1 yrs.)	1973
Education	21.5%	1965(12.6 yrs.)	1966
English	19.6%	1953(29.9 yrs.)	1964
German & Russian	30.7%	1951(30.9 yrs.)	1964
History	23.4%	1949(29.6 yrs.)	1961
Math	47.5%	1964(8.9 yrs.)	1964
Music	19.5%	1959(15.8 yrs.)	1964
Philosophy & Religion	22.9%	1945(37.3 yrs.)	1963
Physical Education	11.1%	1977--	1977--
Physics	47.8%	1941(26.4 yrs.)	1939
Political Science	16.2%	1954(35.3 yrs.)	1968
Psychology	13.0%	1973(4.7 yrs.)	1975
Romance Language	37.3%	1957(17.3 yrs.)	1958
Sociology & Anthropology	16.6%	1961(18.9 yrs.)	1969
Zoology	30.0%	1937(14.8 yrs.)	1941
Other	20.0%	1951(23.1 yrs.)	1951
Totals	23.6%	1953(27.7 yrs.)	1964

Appendix: 184

Department	Average Date of Acquisition of Noncirculating Books/Standard Deviation	Median Date of Acquisition of Noncirculating Books	# of Missing Books/ Percent of Books Assigned to Department
Art	1969(9.9 yrs.)	1971	1(1.9%)
Botany	1950(15.0 yrs.)	1955	0(0%)
Chemistry	1969(7.0 yrs.)	1968	0(0%)
Classical Languages	1971(5.8 yrs.)	1971	0(0%)
Communication Arts & Sciences	1974--	1974	1(14.3%)
Earth Sciences	1966(11.1 yrs.)	1968	2(5.7%)
Economics	1968(13.0 yrs.)	1975	2(5.7%)
Education	1970(5.8 yrs.)	1968	1(.8%)
English	1968(9.6 yrs.)	1970	3(1.2%)
German & Russian	1960(14.4 yrs.)	1967	1(2.5%)
History	1965(13.2 yrs.)	1970	9(3.4%)
Math	1969(7.8 yrs.)	1968	0(0%)
Music	1973(7.4 yrs.)	1976	0(0%)
Philosophy & Religion	1967(10.1 yrs.)	1969	5(3.5%)
Physical Education	1978--	1978--	0(0%)
Physics	1956(13.3 yrs.)	1962	1(4.3%)
Political Science	1965(17.6 yrs.)	1976	8(10%)
Psychology	1975(5.6 yrs.)	1977	2(8.7%)
Romance Languages	1967(11.3 yrs.)	1970	6(7.2%)
Sociology & Anthropology	1966(14.3 yrs.)	1971	1(1.6%)
Zoology	1948(7.5 yrs.)	1947	1(1.6%)
Other	1959(15.2 yrs.)	1964	1(.9%)
Totals	1966(12.3 yrs.)	1969	44(2.7%)

72

Appendix: 185

DePauw University

Book Use Study

	Date of Publication Percent	Date of Acquisition	Last Circulation Date
Pre 1850	4 (.2)		
1850-1874	15 (.9)		
1875-1899	35 (2.2)		
1900-1909	35 (2.2)		
1910-1919	41 (2.6)	2 (.1)	1 (.06)
1920-1939	82 (5.2)	1(.06)	0 (0)
1930-1939	129 (8.1)	125 (7.8)	4(.2)
1940-1949	176 (11.1)	166 (10.5)	13 (.8)
1950-1959	242 (15.2)	245 (15.4)	34 (2.1)
1960-1969	479 (30.2)	495 (31.2)	187 (11.8)
1970-1979	343 (21.6)	457 (28.8)	706 (44.5)
1980	4	37	224(14.1)
			86 missing (5.4)
	2 no date	59 no date	375 no circulation (23.6)
Total	1587	1587	1587
1976-1980	99 (6.2)	239 (15)	640 (40.3)

Appendix: 186

DePauw University

Book Use Study

January 1981

Uncirculated Books

	Date of Publication	Date of Acquisition
Pre 1850	1(.2)	
1850-1874	8 (2.1)	
1874-1899	18 (4.8)	
1900-1909	9 (2.4)	
1910-1919	8 (2.1)	
1920-1929	17 (4.5)	1 (.2)
1930-1939	26 (6.9)	24 (6.4)
1940-1949	22 (5.9)	15 (4.0)
1950-1959	40 (10.7)	34 (9.1)
1960-1969	98 (26.1)	111 (29.6)
1970-1979	121 (32.3)	149 (39.7)
1980-	2	24 (6.4)
	1 no date	17 no date
Total	375	375
1976-1980	47 (12.5)	98 (26.1)

Average Publication Date 1953

Standard Deviation Years

Mode-Publication Date 1973

Average Acquisition Date 1966

Standards Deviation 12 years

Mode Aquisition Date

Appendix: 187

DE PAUW UNIVERSITY
BOOK USE STUDY

January 1981

Books Uncirculated by Year
of Acquisition

Year	Total # of Books	Total # of Uncirculated Books	Uncirculated Books Books as Percent of all Books Acquired
1910	1	0	0
1911	1	0	0
1929	1	1	100%
1930	1	0	0
1931	2	1	50%
1932	11	1	9%
1933	12	2	16%
1934	12	0	0%
1935	12	3	25%
1936	8	1	12%
1937	15	5	33%
1938	27	8	30%
1939	25	3	12%
1940	12	2	17%
1941	24	1	4%
1942	19	3	16%
1943	11	0	0%
1944	14	3	21%
1945	9	3	33%
1946	12	0	0%
1947	23	2	9%
1948	14	1	7%
1949	28	0	0%
1950	25	4	16%
1951	24	2	8%
1952	21	4	6%
1953	14	1	7%
1954	31	8	26%
1955	28	5	18%
1956	11	2	19%
1957	21	3	15%
1958	28	2	8%
1959	41	3	8%
1960	42	11	27%
1961	56	11	20%
1962	28	3	11%
1963	43	10	24%
1964	48	8	17%
1965	39	6	16%
1966	51	9	18%

1967	54	17	32%
1968	70	21	30%
1969	64	15	23%
1970	53	11	21%
1971	56	11	20%
1972	40	7	18%
1973	46	9	20%
1974	58	21	37%
1975	45	16	36%
1976	49	18	37%
1977	44	23	53%
1978	30	15	50%
1979	36	18	50%
1980	37	24	65%
Missing	59	17	29%
Total	1587	375	23.6%

Appendix: 189

DE PAUW UNIVERSITY

BOOK USE STUDY

January 1981

*(Economics)

	Year of Publication/ Percent	Year of Acquisition/ Percent	Year of Last Circulated/ Percent**	Year of Acquisition of Non-Circulating Books
Pre 1850	0 (0%)	0	0	0
1850-1874	1 (.8%)	0	0	0
1875-1899	1 (.8%)	0	0	0
1900-1909	1 (.8%)	0	0	0
1910-1919	2 (1.7%)	0	0	0
1920-1929	4 (3.4%)	0	0	0
1930-1939	4 (3.4%)	7 (5.9%)	0	2 (8%)
1940-1949	10 (8.5%)	12 (10.2%)	2 (2.3%)	0
1950-1959	20 (16.9%)	16 (13.6%)	5 (5.7%)	3 (12%)
1960-1969	27 (22.9%)	31 (26.3%)	14 (15.9%)	4 (16%)
1970-1979	46 (38.9%)	46 (39.0%)	43 (48.9%)	15 (60%)
1980-1981	2 (1.7%)	3 (2.5%)	24 (27.3%)	0
Missing		3 (2.5%)	5	1
Total	118	118	88	25
Average	1960	1964	1973	1968
Median	1966	1967	1977	1975
Average (all books)	1952	1961	1974	1966
Median (all books)	1960	1964	1976	1969

* These books are those assigned to economics by call number that are part of a 1% random sample of the DePauw University Libraries' book collection.

** Excluding non-circulating and missing books.

77

Appendix: 190

DE PAUW UNIVERSITY

BOOK USE STUDY

January 1981

*(English)

	Year of Publication/ Percent	Year of Acquisition/ Percent	Year of Last Circulated Percent**	Year of Acquisition of Non-Circulating Books
Pre 1850	0	0	0	0
1850-1874	2 (.8%)	0	0	0
1875-1899	7 (2.9%)	0	0	0
1900-1909	10 (4.1%)	0	0	0
1910-1919	6 (2.4%)	0	0	0
1920-1929	15 (6.1%)	0	0	0
1930-1939	18 (7.3%)	24 (9.8%)	0	0
1940-1949	32 (13.1%)	24 (9.8%)	3 (1.6%)	0
1950-1959	36 (14.7%)	41 (16.7%)	4 (2.1%)	5 (10.4%)
1960-1969	75 (30.6%)	78 (31.8%)	35 (18.5%)	16 (33.3%)
1970-1979	43 (17.6%)	66 (26.9%)	111 (58.7%)	19 (39.6%)
1980-1981	1 (.4%)	4 (1.6%)	29 (15.3%)	4 (8.3%)
Missing	0	8 (3.3%)	7 (3.7%)	3 (6.3%)
Total	245	245	189	48
Average	1951	1960	1973	1968
Median	1958	1964	1976	1970
Average (all books)	1952	1961	1974	1966
Median (all books)	1960	1964	1976	1969

* These books are those assigned to English by call number that are part of a 1% random sample of the DePauw University Libraries' book collection.

** Excluding missing and noncirculating books.

DE PAUW UNIVERSITY

BOOK USE STUDY

January 1981

*(History)

	Year of Publication/ Percent	Year of Acquisition/ Percent	Year of Last Circulated Percent**	Year of Acquisition of Non-Circulating Books
Pre 1850	1 (.4%)	0	0	0
1850-1874	3 (1.1%)	0	0	0
1875-1899	5 (1.9%)	0	0	0
1900-1909	7 (2.6%)	0	0	0
1910-1919	8 (3.0%)	0	0	0
1920-1929	17 (6.4%)	1 (0.4%)	0	1 (1.6%)
1930-1939	27 (10.2%)	21 (2.9%)	0	3 (4.8%)
1940-1949	25 (9.4%)	37 (14%)	0	4 (6.5%)
1950-1959	40 (15.1%)	36 (13.9%)	3 (1.5%)	5 (8.1%)
1960-1969	77 (29.1%)	87 (32.8%)	37 (18.2%)	16 (25.8%)
1970-1979	55 (20.8%)	70 (26.4%)	114 (56.2%)	26 (49.9%)
1980-1981	0	8 (3%)	40 (19.7%)	4 (6.5%)
Missing	0	5 (1.9%)	9 (4.4%)	3 (4.8%)
Total	265	265	203	62
Average	1951	1960	1973	1965
Median	1959	1962	1977	1970
Average (all books)	1952	1961	1974	1966
Median (all books)	1960	1964	1976	1969

* These books are those assigned to history by call number that are part of a 1% random sample of the DePauw University Libraries' book collection.

** Excluding missing and noncirculating books.

Appendix: 192

DE PAUW UNIVERSITY

BOOK USE STUDY

January 1981

*(Math)

	Year of Publication/ Percent	Year of Acquisition/ Percent	Year of Last Circulated Percent**	Year of Acquisition of Non-Circulating Books
Pre 1850	0	0	0	0
1850-1874	0	0	0	0
1875-1899	0	0	0	0
1900-1909	0	0	0	0
1910-1919	0	0	1 (4.8%)	0
1920-1929	2 (5.0%)	0	0	0
1930-1939	1 (2.5%)	1 (2.5%)	0	0
1940-1949	4 (10%)	3 (7.5%)	0	1 (5.3%)
1950-1959	4 (10%)	2 (5.0%)	0	0
1960-1969	23 (57.5%)	20 (50%)	1 (4.8%)	12 (63.2%)
1970-1979	6 (15%)	13 (32.5%)	15 (71.4%)	6 (31.2%)
1980-1981	0	0	3 (14.3%)	0
Missing	0	1 (2.5%)	1 (4.8%)	0
Total	40	40	21	19
Average	1960	1966	1976	1969
Median	1963	1968	1976	1968
Average (all books)	1952	1961	1974	1966
Median (all books)	1960	1964	1976	1969

* These books are those assigned to Math by call number that are part of a 1% random sample of the DePauw University Libraries' book collection.

** Excluding missing and noncirculating books.

Appendix: 193

DE PAUW UNIVERSITY

BOOK USE STUDY

January 1981

*(Music)

	Year of Publication/ Percent	Year of Acquisition/ Percent	Year of Last Circulated Percent**	Year of Acquisition of Non-Circulating Books
Pre 1850	0	0	0	0
1850-1874	0	0	0	0
1875-1899	4 (8.9%)	0	0	0
1900-1909	1 (2.2%)	0	0	0
1910-1919	2 (4.4%)	0	0	0
1920-1929	3 (6.7%)	0	0	0
1930-1939	3 (6.7%)	6 (13%)	0	0
1940-1949	10 (22.2%)	6 (13%)	0	0
1950-1959	7 (15.6%)	6 (13%)	2 (5.4%)	0
1960-1969	10 (22.2%)	10 (21.7%)	3 (8.1%)	2 (22.2%)
1970-1979	5 (11.1%)	12 (26.1%)	20 (54%)	6 (66.7%)
1980-1981	0	2 (4.3%)	7 (18.9%)	1 (4.1%)
Missing	0	4 (8.7%)	5 (13.5%)	0
Total	45	47	37	9
Average	1944	1959	1975	1973
Median	1947	1960	1978	1976
Average (all books)	1952	1961	1974	1966
Median (all books)	1960	1964	1976	1969

* These books are those assigned to Music by call number that are part of a 1% random sample of the DePauw University Libraries' book collection.

** Excluding missing and noncirculating books.

Appendix: 194

DE PAUW UNIVERSITY

BOOK USE STUDY

January 1981

*(Philosophy & Religion)

	Year of Publication/ Percent	Year of Acquisition/ Percent	Year of Last Circulated/ Percent**	Year of Acquisition of Non-Circulating Books
Pre 1850	2 (1.4%)	0	0	0
1850-1874	2 (1.4%)	0	0	0
1875-1899	6 (4.2%)	0	0	0
1900-1909	5 (3.5%)	0	0	0
1910-1919	6 (4.2%)	1 (.7%)	0	0
1920-1929	7 (4.9%)	0	0	0
1930-1939	15 (10.4%)	9 (6.2%)	1 (.9%)	2 (6.1%)
1940-1949	10 (6.9%)	12 (8.3%)	0	0
1950-1959	23 (16%)	31 (21.5%)	5 (4.5%)	4 (12.1%)
1960-1969	34 (23.6%)	36 (25%)	15 (13.5%)	10 (30.3%)
1970-1979	34 (23.6%)	45 (31.3%)	62 (55.9%)	14 (42.4%)
1980-1981	0	2 (1.4%)	20 (18%)	1 (3%)
Missing	0	8 (5.6%)	8 (7.2%)	2 (6.1%)
Total	144	144	111	33
Average	1948	1962	1973	1967
Median	1958	1964	1976	1969
Average (all books)	1952	1961	1974	1966
Median (all books)	1960	1964	1976	1969

* These books are those assigned to philosophy and religion by call number that are part of a 1% random sample of the DePauw University libraries' book collection.

** Excluding non-circulating and missing books.

Appendix: 195

DE PAUW UNIVERSITY

BOOK USE STUDY

January 1981

*(Psychology)

	Year of Publication/ Percent	Year of Acquisition/ Percent	Year of Last Circulated/ Percent**	Year of Acquisition of Non-Circulating Books
Pre 1850	0	0	0	0
1850-1974	0	0	0	0
1875-1899	0	0	0	0
1900-1909	0	0	0	0
1910-1919	0	0	0	0
1920-1929	2 (8.7%)	0	0	0
1930-1939	1 (4.3%)	2 (8.7%)	0	0
1940-1949	2 (8.7%)	3 (13%)	0	0
1950-1959	4 (17.4%)	3 (13%)	0	0
1960-1969	7 (30.4%)	5 (21.7%)	2 (10%)	1 (33.3%)
1970-1979	7 (30.4%)	8 (34.8%)	11 (55%)	1 (33.3%)
1980-1981	0	1 (4.3%)	5 (25%)	1 (33.3%)
Missing	0	1(4.3%)	2 (10%)	0
Total	23	23	20	3
Average	1959	1962	1976	1975
Median	1963	1965	1978	1977
Average (all books)	1952	1961	1974	1966
Median (all books)	1960	1964	1976	1969

* These books are those assigned to psychology by call number that are part of a 1% random sample of the DePauw University Libraries' book collection.

** Excluding non-circulating and missing books.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO CIRCLE 79

APRIL 1982

COLLECTION ANALYSIS AND MANAGEMENT PROJECT

SOCIAL SCIENCE TASK FORCE

Report

Project Team-

Judith Arnold
William Ernst
Emily Melton
Kinga Rzyski
Stephen Wiberley, Chair

CONTENTS

I	Introduction	page 81
II	Sociology at UICC	82
III	History of the Collections for Sociology	82
IV	Collection Goals: Sociology	84
V	Methodology of Collection Evaluation	85
VI	Evaluation of the Graduate Collection	87
VII	Evaluation of the Undergraduate Book Collection	91
VIII	Commentary on Evaluations	92
IX	Estimation of the Cost of Collection Development for Sociology	94
X	Cost of Filling Gaps in the Book Collection	94
XI	Estimating the Cost of Acquiring Current Books	95
XII	Estimating the Cost of Current Journals	96
XIII	Cost of Replacing Missing Core Journals	97
XIV	Summary; Recommendations; and Assessment of Methods	97

I. INTRODUCTION

The assignment of the Social Science Task Force was to develop models for evaluation of social science collections and for estimation of the cost of building such collections. To do this the task force was, first, to evaluate the collections that support research and instruction in Sociology, and, second, to estimate the cost of building and maintaining these collections. Third, the task force was to assess what it had done and suggest possible improvements in the methods used. Although collection evaluation and estimation of costs of collection development are obviously important, relatively little has been written about them. Consequently, at several points the task force used untested techniques and could reach only tentative conclusions. While the task force did reach firm conclusions about a number of other issues, parts of the effort described here are first steps in developing new methods in collection management.

II. SOCIOLOGY AT UICC

The Department of Sociology of the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle offers work leading to the Bachelor of Arts, the Master of Arts, and the Doctor of Philosophy. In 1980 the Department awarded thirty-one bachelor's degrees, one master's degree and four doctorates. It has 40 faculty including several who hold appointments in other departments or at the University of Illinois at the Medical Center. In the last academic year there were 120 undergraduate majors and 59 graduate students in sociology. The Department emphasizes applied sociology and the use of metropolitan Chicago as a laboratory setting for the study of social problems. Numerous faculty publications, research grants, and doctoral dissertations show how well UICC's sociologists take advantage of their urban location. All graduate students receive intensive training in a variety of empirical methods. The program for master's students concentrates on three broad subfields: social organization, social psychology, and demography and human ecology. Doctoral students develop their programs in one of three areas -- social psychology, medical sociology, or the sociology of political and economic organization. Specialties offered in the graduate program reflect research strengths of the faculty. The Department lists 14 specialties in the American Sociological Associations's Guide to Graduate Departments of Sociology, 1981: applied sociology/social policy; criminology/delinquency; economy and society; medical sociology; methodology: qualitative approaches; methodology: quantitative approaches; occupations/professions; political sociology; race/ethnic/minority relations; social organization/formal/complex; social psychology; sociology of aging/social gerontology; sociology of work; and urban sociology.

III. HISTORY OF THE COLLECTIONS FOR SOCIOLOGY

In 1966 a proposal of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology for a program leading to the M.A. in Sociology reported that:

> Up to the present, library facilities on campus have not been adequate to support the graduate program, but they show signs of rapid improvement. Current journal subscriptions are now entirely adequate; the back files of the most important journals are very good; back files of other journals are spotty but improving. We are working to make the book holdings adequate by Fall of

> 1967. The library on campus is a repository for many Government publications (e.g. in demography), and this adds much strength for certain types of research. Very good libraries in the Chicago area somewhat alleviate the problem of library use for faculty research. The library at the University of Illinois Medical Center (a few blocks away) is excellent in medical sociology -- one of the areas that the Department will emphasize.

Apparently efforts at improvement were quite successful. Two years later, in its proposal for a doctoral program, the Department of Sociology boasted of subscriptions to over 60 sociological journals, including the 18 most important, and of over 9,000 books in sociology "with excellent coverage of the most recent books." The proposal continued:

> In recent systematic checks of bibliographies in our proposed areas of specialization for the Ph.D., about two-thirds of <u>all</u> titles are in the library. Over 90% of the titles rated important by our graduate faculty are in the library. Of 141 titles in sociological research methods included in the bibliography of an established, Ph.D.-granting department, our library had 82% early in 1968. The rest are on order.

The Department again emphasized the importance of the government publications collection to research in areas such as medical sociology, demography, and social welfare. And it repeated almost verbatim its statement about use of other libraries in the Chicago area, particularly the library at the Medical Center.

For the years after 1968 no documents have been located that summarize, as do the proposals for graduate programs, the strengths and weaknesses of the collections for Sociology. During most of this period library representatives from the Department bore most of the responsibility for selection of materials, and each department had its own allocation for acquisitions. For Sociology these allocations were greatest in FY 70 and FY 71 -- about $14,000 each year. Thereafter funding fell off sharpely to a low of $5,000 in FY 73. In most years it was about $8,000. Of course, in terms of purchasing power none of the allocations for Sociology after FY 71 came close to those of FY 70-71.

Based on the Department's report of 1968 and the levels of funding in the next ten years, one could infer that at the beginning of the 1970s the collection for Sociology was strong and that it was in great danger of losing that strength during the next seven years. Nevertheless, Sociology perhaps was better able to cope with such cuts than were other departments because much of the material it needed was vital to other fields. Indeed, one library representative for Sociology in the early 1970s remembers relying on Psychology to select some of the books and journals needed for social psychology, on Criminal Justice to meet some needs for Sociology's specialty in crime and deviance, on Political Science to help cover sociology of politics, and on Urban Sciences to assist with materials in urban sociology. Furthermore, the Department adjusted its periodical list by cancelling a number of titles in 1976 and 1977.

In 1978 the Library reorganized collection development by appointing bibliographers, each with broad subject responsibility, and by allocating the acquisitions budget into guidelines for each of the broad subject areas. Now one bibliographer with a single guideline for the social sciences, is responsible for developing collections for Sociology, Psychology, Political Science, Criminal Justice, and seven other fields that previously had separate guidelines. Since 1978 the overall acquisitions budget has increased sharply in actual dollars and modestly in real dollars, allowing for extensive acquisitions of current materials in social science and some retrospective purchases, including materials missed in the early 1970s.

IV. COLLECTION GOALS: SOCIOLOGY

The basic goal for development of the collection for Sociology is to acquire the printed materials needed in support of instruction at the undergraduate and graduate levels and of doctoral and post-doctoral research, both ongoing and likely future, as far as funds will allow. Emphasis is placed on obtaining all major published scholarship in sociology in the English langauge. This is done through subscription to the leading journals in the Department's areas of specialization and through systematic acquisition of the monographic publications of the leading publishers of sociology. Particular effort is made to acquire all scholarly and many popular materials about Chicago and its people, in many instances in multiple copies. Government documents -- federal, Illinois, and local -- are

acquired in special depth and breadth. Because of the Library's youth and the need to replace missing books, careful attention is given to acquiring reprints. A long range, yet unfulfilled, goal is to develop ties with antiquarian bookdealers to enable the Library to obtain out-of-print material needed for reserve, to replace missing books, and to fill in gaps.

V. METHODOLOGY OF COLLECTION EVALUATION

To evaluate the Library's collections for Sociology the task force compared holdings with samples of entries from authoritative lists of relevant library materials. This straightforward approach, first outlined by William Webb of the University of Colorado and notably employed recently by the Stanford University Libraries, calls for dividing the collection into parts, finding an authoritative list for each part, pulling a sample of entries from each list, checking holdings against the sample, determining which lists were best covered by the Library's collection, and then acquiring materials in the areas found to be least well covered.

At the outset, the task force decided to evaluate UICC's collections for Sociology at two levels: the graduate -- taken here to include both graduate study and post-doctoral research -- and the undergraduate. To evaluate the graduate collection, the task force sought a list for each of the Department's fourteen specialties that are named in the American Sociological Association's Guide to Graduate Departments. These lists had to be large enough to cover adequately the literature of a specialty. Sampling was necessary because of the size of the lists and the task force's plan to search the shelves in addition to the catalog. To facilitate sampling it was desirable to select lists that were in one alphabetical sequence with no duplication of entries within a given list. With the benefit of many useful suggestions from the Department of Sociology, the task force found acceptable lists for all specialties except economy and society, although the list for medical sociology had more than one alphabetical sequence and about 5 percent duplication. Because the formal bibliography of sociology is extremely limited, the lists chosen were bibliographies in the backs of the books that surveyed the 13 specialties. (The lists are cited in Appendix A.)

To evaluate the undergraduate book collection, the task force also checked the Library's holdings against a sample of entries from the bibliography, Books for College

Libraries (1975), and Choice, a journal of book reviews, volumes 11-18 (1974-1981). Both of these sources are designed to assist librarians in selection of books for undergraduate collections. Books for College Libraries (BCL) is more selective than Choice, but because it is now quite dated, it was thought best to treat its entries and those in the sociology section in issues of Choice as one list. Evaluations of the Library's collections in Psychology (assessed in 1976) and English (in 1977) had compared holdings to books listed in BCL. The task force's aim was to compare findings for Sociology with these earlier evaluations.

A disproportionate stratified random sample was pulled from the 13 graduate lists. The desired sample size was 1,300 or 100 from each list. As there was a 37 percent duplication factor among these lists, the actual sample taken from each list was approximately 159 or over 2,050 entries. Members of the task force pulled systematic random samples from each list. From the Books for College Libraries/Choice list the task force pulled a systematic random sample of 1,044.

To understand the results of the searching, it is necessary to understand the way it was done. First, all entries in the sample were searched on UICC's LCS data base. If an entry was not found there, all other indexes to the UICC collection -- card catalogue, serial holdings list, central serials record, documents indexes, etc. -- were searched. After finding the call number of a book or location of a journal, task force members searched the shelves.

If an entry was not indexed by UICC or in the Library's in-process file, task force members searched the LCS files of Urbana, Medical Center, DePaul, IIT, Governors State, and Chicago State in that order. (They did not search the data bases of other libraries for items missing from UICC.) As soon as an entry was found, the search ended. Thus, if a book is held by Urbana, task force members did not determine if it was held by any other library. OCLC was the last data base searched. It is important to realize that the task force did not note circulation status of books in LCS libraries nor did it attempt to borrow books found in LCS or OCLC. In other words, the task force did not determine availability of materials indexed by other libraries, as it did for materials indexed by UICC.

VI. EVALUATION OF THE GRADUATE COLLECTION

The 13 lists that cover the graduate collection had entries for a full range of forms of library materials. The number of each form is given in Table 1. Books and journal articles obviously dominate, with the former comprising 50 percent and the latter 46 percent of the citations.[1] Unpublished papers are important only on lists for methodology: qualitative approaches and sociology of aging/social gerontology. In view of the Department of Sociology's emphasis on government documents during the Library's early history, the small percentage of documents in the sample (1 percent) is surprising. Perhaps this is because documents are used in research, but the lists here are bibliographies in surveys of the specialties, not in reports on research.

The distribution of Library of Congress call numbers for books in the sample that are held by the UICC Library indicates the highly interdisciplinary nature of sociology. 39 percent of the books are in the HM-HV classifications traditionally associated with sociology. 16 percent are in political science and law; another 16 percent in economics. 5 percent are in psychology; another 5 percent in American history. In all, over 60 percent of the books are from fields other than sociology. Such a distribution, however, should not be surprising for a Department that covers sociology of politics, social psychology, and economics and society.

58 percent of the books and journal articles in the sample were published before 1971. This fact should be considered in relation to the dates of publication of the lists: 3 published in 1977, 4 in 1978, 2 in 1979, 3 in 1980, and 1 in 1981. Thus, most of the material cited is more than 6 years old, and was published before the sharp cuts in the Library's acquisitions budget.

Only 2 of the 1,159 books in the sample were in a language other than English. An overwhelming percentage of the publications are American. Of the 37 leading journals, 36 are published in the United States. Only 5 percent of the books could be identified as foreign from imprint information given in the lists. A number of books manufactured in Britain may have had American cities as places of publication because many leading British publishers maintain offices in the United States. The prices of such books would generally be in line with British, not American, books. The existence of an American office facilitates their acquisition.

[1] In this report percentages given for the entire graduate list are weighted.

TABLE 1

Numbers of Forms of Materials
Sampled from Graduate Lists

Specialty	Books	Journal Articles	Unpublished Papers	Government Documents	Dissertations
Applied Sociology/ Social Policy	99	49	1	1	0
Criminology/ Delinquency	72	77	3	5	1
Medical Sociology	57	103	1	1	0
Methodology: Qualitative Approaches	98	43	11	0	6
Methodology: Quantitative Approaches	107	51	0	1	2
Occupations/ Professions	69	79	2	2	2
Political Sociology	114	49	1	0	0
Race/Ethnic/Minority Relations	118	39	0	2	0
Social Organization Formal/Complex	100	46	1	0	3
Social Psychology	56	101	1	0	1
Sociology of Aging/ Social Gerontology	70	70	10	6	1
Sociology of Work	103	55	1	1	0
Urban Sociology	95	58	6	2	0

Table 2 shows the percentage of items indexed by the Library for each stratum in the sample. In seven specialties the percentage is very close to or above 90. Only medical sociology, sociology of aging/social gerontology, and methodology: qualitative approaches are under 80 percent. For the entire graduate list the Library has a substantial proportion, 84 percent. At the 95 percent confidence level, the standard error is ± 1.2 percent. Furthermore, 90 percent of the items indexed are on LCS.

Of the 1,732 items indexed, 1,518 or 88 percent were available, that is, either on the shelf or circulating. To a significant extent the Library has kept these items available by buying added or replacement copies. When extra copies of the 1,732 items sampled are taken into account, the total number of copies for these items is 2,605. This is 1.5 copies per item. Of these 2,605 copies, 2,034 or 80 percent could be accounted for as on the shelf or circulating. Almost all of the additional copies are of books.

223 of the 2,034 copies available were circulating at the time of searching. This means 1,811 were on the shelf. Of these 9 (or less than 1 percent) were unbound, 51 or 3 percent were damaged, and 20 (1 percent) were misshelved. Only 9 items were in the Library's in-process file. That is, less than 1 percent were ordered but yet to be processed.

Of the 321 items not indexed by the UICC Library, 183 or 64 percent were available from either the University of Illinois-Urbana or the Medical Center. Of those not indexed by the University of Illinois campuses, only 14 were held by the Chicago Academic Library Council (CALC) schools whose holdings are on LCS. OCLC lists 54 of the sampled items not indexed by the University of Illinois Libraries or CALC/LCS libraries. In all, then, 260 or 83 percent of the 321 items not indexed by UICC's Library could be found through LCS or OCLC, or in the Library's in-process file. Viewed from another perspective, 1,983 or 97 percent of the 2,053 items sampled were either indexed by UICC or could be located through LCS or OCLC. Furthermore, over 90 percent of the sampled items were accessible either through the University of Illinois library system or from Chicago area libraries — DePaul, IIT, Governors State, and Chicago State.

TABLE 2

Percentages Indexed by UICC Library
of Items Sampled from Graduate Lists

Specialty	Number of Items Sampled	Number of Items Indexed	Percentage Indexed
Applied Sociology/ Social Policy	152	123	81.0
Criminology/ Delinquency	160	148	93.0
Medical Sociology	162	107	66.0
Methodology: Qualitative Approaches	160	126	79.0
Methodology: Quantitative Approaches	159	135	85.0
Occupations/ Professions	154	137	89.0
Political Sociology	164	145	88.0
Race/Ethnic Minority Relations	159	130	82.0
Social Organization Formal/Complex	151	139	92.0
Social Psychology	159	144	91.0
Sociology of Aging/ Social Gerontology	157	120	76.0
Sociology of Work	158	139	88.0
Urban Sociology	158	139	88.0

VII. EVALUATION OF THE UNDERGRADUATE BOOK COLLECTION

All of the items in the Books for College Libraries/Choice list are books. These sources are designed to guide selection of books for undergraduate collections. The Library has indexed and had available roughly the same percentages of books on the BCL/Choice list and the graduate list. From a population of 3,077, the task force pulled a sample of 1,044 entries. Of these 852 or 82 percent were indexed by the Library. 23 others were found in the in-process file; that is, they were ordered but not yet processed. 98 percent of the books indexed were on LCS. 730 (or 86 percent) of the 852 books indexed by the Library were available to patrons, that is , on the shelf or circulating. For the 852 books there was a total of 1,432 copies (1.7 per item). Of these 1,432 copies, 1,134 or 79 percent were available.

Of the 192 books not indexed by UICC, 142 or 74 percent were indexed by the libraries at other University of Illinois campuses. CALC schools whose holdings are on LCS indexed 16 (8 percent) of those not held by the Urbana or Medical Center campuses. Of those neither at a University of Illinois library nor a CALC/LCS library 10 (5 percent) were found in OCLC libraries. In summary, 1,020 or 98 percent of the 1,044 books sampled were either indexed by UICC or could be located through LCS or OCLC. As was true of items sampled to evaluate the graduate collection, over 90 percent of the BCL/Choice books were readily accessible either through the University of Illinois library system or from Chicago area libraries -- DePaul, IIT, Governors State, and Chicago State.

Data from searching the undergraduate list indicate the damaging effects of the budget cuts during most of the early 1970s. Table 3 shows that the Library acquired only 64 percent of the books sampled from Choice, 1974-1977. This percentage can be compared not only to the overall percentages for the undergraduate and graduate lists, but also to the Library's current rate of acquisition of books reviewed in Contemporary Sociology (CS), the American Sociology Association's journal of book reviews.

In the last two years the Library has acquired approximately 80 percent of CS books before they were reviewed. Such breadth and depth of coverage is necessary to support research, but it was not possible in the early 1970s.

TABLE 3

Percentage Indexed of Books
Reviewed in Choice 1974-1977

Choice Vol. (Year)	Items	Items Sampled	Sampled Items Indexed by Library	Percentage Indexed by Library
11 (1974)	248	83	57	69.0
12 (1975)	252	85	54	64.0
13 (1976)	223	74	43	58.0
14 (1977)	229	77	49	64.0
	952	319	203	64.0

Standard error is ± 3.5 percent at the 95% confidence level.

VIII. COMMENTARY ON EVALUATIONS

Given its youth and cutbacks in its acquisitions budget during most of the 1970s, it is remarkable that the Library managed to acquire 84 percent of the items sampled from the graduate lists and 82 percent of the books on the BCL/Choice list. (See Table 4 for a complete comparison of the findings from the two lists.) The latter figure compares with the 77 percent found for BCL's English and American literature listings in 1977 and 91 percent for Psychology in 1976. One would expect that the Library would have acquired a slightly smaller percentage of the books from the BCL/Choice list than from any list taken solely from BCL. A few books covered by Choice receive unfavorable review that recommend against their acquisition.

In the three graduate specialties where the collection appears weakest -- medical sociology, methodology: qualitative approaches, and sociology of aging/social gerontology -- certain circumstances should be taken into account. From the outset of the graduate

TABLE 4

Summary of Results of Searching
Graduate and Undergraduate Lists

	Graduate	Undergraduate
Population of list	5,300	3,077
Sample size	2,053	1,044
Sampled items indexed	1,732	852
% of sample indexed	84	82
Items on LCS	1,559	838
% of LCS items of those indexed	90	98
Items available	1,518	730
% available of items indexed	88	86
Copies held of indexed items	2,605	1,432
Copies per item	1.5	1.7
Copies available	2,034	1,134
% available of all copies	80	79
Items not indexed by UICC	321	192
Items not indexed by UICC in UIUC, UIMC	183	142
% of items not indexed by UICC in UIUC, UIMC	64	74
Items not indexed by UICC, UIUC, UIMC in CALC/LCS	14	16
% of items not indexed by UICC, UIUC, UIMC in CALC/LCS	4	8
Items not indexed by UICC, UIUC, UIMM, CALC/LCS in OCLC	54	10
% of items not indexed by UICC, UIUC, UIMC, CALC/LCS in OCLC	15	5
Number of items at UICC or on LCS or OCLC	1,983	1,020
% of sample at UICC or on LCS or OCLC	97	98
% of sample in UI or CALC/LCS	94	96

program, sociologists and librarians at UICC expected to rely to some extent on the collections at the Medical Center for materials in medical sociology. Thus, one would expect that UICC's holdings in this area would be the weakest among all the specialties. Holdings of all University of Illinois libraries include 151 of the 162 items in the sample for medical sociology. The lists for sociology of aging/social gerontology and methodology: qualitative approaches contain entries for 10 and 11 unpublished papers respectively. Such papers are normally outside the Library's collecting program, and when they are eliminated from the sample, the percentage of items acquired rises above 80.

After medical sociology, quantitative methods, and sociology of aging, the specialties where the collection is relatively weak are applied sociology/social policy and methodology: quantitative approaches. As the Library holds over 80 percent of the items sampled for these specialties, the weakness is not serious. Nevertheless, because both of these areas are important components of the Department's program, they should receive extra attention in retrospective and ongoing collection development.

IX. ESTIMATION OF THE COST OF COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT FOR SOCIOLOGY

Almost all of the literature on estimating the cost of developing collections deals with the cost of entire collections, not components like Sociology. After long and often fruitless efforts to estimate the cost of developing a collection for Sociology, the task force appreciates this gap in the literature. What follows are discussions about estimating different types of costs. These discussions range from ones that offer apparently reliable figures of cost to ones that only outline the limits of our knowledge.

X. COST OF FILLING GAPS IN THE BOOK COLLECTION

100 books in the sample pulled from the graduate lists were missing from the Library but available in print (this includes reprints). These constitute about 5 percent of the items sampled. The average cost of each book is $12.79. If similar costs and percentages hold for all entries on the 13 graduate lists, then the cost of replacing all missing books now in print would be -- allowing for duplication among entries on the different lists -- roughly $2,135.

In addition there are books in the sample that the Library never acquired but are still in print or available in reprint. These are slightly over 3 percent of the items sampled. The average cost of each book was $13.38. If similar costs and percentages hold for all entries on the 13 graduate lists, then the cost of purchasing all books never acquired, but in print would be -- allowing for duplication among entries on the different lists -- $1,430.

Finally, 97 books from the graduate sample, both missing and never acquired, are now out-of-print. The task force divided the books into 8 groups and sent each group to an out-of-print dealer who specializes in books like those in the group. Thus far 6 dealers have replied. In all they could supply only 2 books from their stocks at a total cost of $27.00. Four of the dealers have promised to keep our desiderata in mind, and we will record the results of their searching. For now there is nothing to be said about average or gross costs of acquiring out-of-print material.

XI. ESTIMATING THE COST OF ACQUIRING CURRENT BOOKS

To estimate the cost of acquiring current books one must determine the number needed and the average cost. The former is particularly difficult to estimate. Sociology, as data gathered in this project show, is highly interdisciplinary. Consequently, it is not possible to place limits on the books relevant to the field. One can only point to standards that appear to be minimal levels of acquisition needed to maintain a research collection.

Contemporary Sociology (CS) was the best standard for the acquisition of books that the task force could find. CS is the American Sociological Association's journal of book reviews. Its editors apparently select for review about one-third of the books they receive. Their selection of a book for review identifies it as one important for sociologists. In 1980 CS reviewed 550 titles; in 1981 that number will exceed 600. CS reviews books at least one to three years after publication, and the prices it lists, while out of date, are accurate for the year of publication of the books reviewed. Of the 550 titles reviewed in 1980, 26 had no prices listed. The total cost of acquiring the remaining 524 titles would have been $8,567 or an average of $16.34 a volume. Most of the books reviewed were published in 1978 (310 titles) and 1979 (117 titles). Average cost in 1978 was $15.20, in 1979 $15.72, a 3.4 percent increase.

Other than CS the best possible source for prices of books for Sociology probably is Publisher's Weekly (PW). PW is the most widely recognized source of American book prices. The average cost of books in PW's category of sociology/economics was significantly higher than those found in CS. These were $29.66 for 1978 and $43.57 for 1979. PW acknowledges that its category sociology/economics includes figures for very expensive special and technical reports which skew the average. In some respects it is more useful to compare CS prices to the overall average cost of books found by PW: $16.21 in 1978 and $18.02 is 1979. Even in this comparison the cost per volume reviewed by CS is less.

The task force's research, then, indicates that the best source not only for estimating the number of monographs needed for a research collection in Sociology, but also average price of books, is Contemporary Sociology. While its information is somewhat dated, no other source more carefully screens books of interest to sociologists nor covers the field more comprehensively.

XII. ESTIMATING THE COST OF CURRENT JOURNALS

As is true of books, to estimate the cost of acquiring current journals one must first determine the number needed. As is also true of books, the highly interdisciplinary nature of sociology prevents any precision in determining this number. Journal collections for a given discipline are frequently divided into two parts, a core collection of essential and heavily used titles, and a secondary collection of other relevant titles. Identifying the components of the two parts is never easy. But citation studies are a good guide to identifying the core, and a list of journals where practitioners might publish provides a guide to secondary journals.

To identify the core journals needed for Sociology, the task force analyzed citations to journals in the sample pulled from the graduate lists. Any journal cited at least two times in a single list was selected for further consideration. Of these selected journals, 37 titles were cited five or more times overall. These accounted for more than half of all citations to journals in the sample and may be said to constitute a core collection.

Of the 37 titles, UICC now subscribes to all but three. The exceptions, Journal of Chronic Diseases, Medical Care, and Social Science and Medicine (the last now in 5 parts),

are held by the Medical Center. In 1981, subscription costs for the 34 titles were $1,330 or $39 each. In order to estimate price trends for these journals, subscription costs for 1979-1981 were considered. In 1978 these journals cost $960, in 1981, $1,330. The total price increase of $370 is about 38 percent. From 1980 to 1981 subscription prices rose from $1,100 to $1,330 or about 21 percent. These data and informal projections from publishers for 1982 indicate that double digit inflation in journal costs is a trend likely to continue.

In addition to estimating the cost of a core collection for Sociology, the task force attempted to estimate the Library's total expenditure for journals of interest to sociologists. It compared the Library's subscriptions to journals listed in Marvin Sussman's Guide to Journals in Sociology and Related Fields. This book lists 401 journals where a sociologist might publish. Titles encompass scholarly and popular journals in sociology and journals from related fields like law, psychology, and political science. Of the 401 titles listed, UICC receives 273 (68 percent). The cost of these journals for 1981 is $10,500 and the average price about $38.50.

XIII. COST OF REPLACING MISSING CORE JOURNALS

With almost no exceptions the Library has acquired complete runs of the 34 core journals to which it currently subscribes. But vandalism and theft have destroyed the integrity of at least one or two volumes of most of these runs. To replace in microform the missing or incomplete volumes would cost about $2,100. Besides suffering from vandalism and theft, some volumes of core journals are simply starting to wear out from heavy use. With their special vulnerability to theft, vandalism, and wear, the runs of core journals require careful examination at least twice a year.

XIV. SUMMARY; RECOMMENDATIONS; AND ASSESSMENT OF METHODS

The evaluation of the collection for Sociology and the attempt to estimate the cost of maintaining it, have yielded valuable information. Indeed, the very processes themselves were an opportunity to learn more about the programs of the Department, the literature of the field, and the sources of financial data for library materials.

The most important conclusions of the study are:

1) The literature of the specialties of Sociology is highly interdisciplinary, overwhelmingly in English, and principally books and journals.

2) While acknowledging that no standards exist regarding either the percentage of materials on an authoritative list that a library should hold or the rate of loss of materials from academic libraries, it appears that:

a) the collection for Sociology is strong, with the Library holding approximately 84 percent of the materials on the lists used;

b) losses of materials for Sociology have been considerable, approximately 20 percent for all copies processed during the Library's history.

3) Over 80 percent of the materials never acquired by the UICC Library are in libraries closely linked to UICC: those of the other University of Illinois campuses and of the CALC/LCS schools.

4) Most of the books on the authoritative lists that were never acquired or are missing from the Library are in print. It would cost about $3,600 to purchase them.

5) Needed out-of-print books are extremely difficult to acquire.

6) Sociology books have been relatively inexpensive, but more than 1,500 are published each year, over 500 of which are significant.

7) Journal prices are increasing at a rate of over 10 percent per year.

8) To replace in microform the missing or incomplete volumes in the Library's runs of core journals for Sociolgy would cost about $2,100.

The results of this study suggest three recommendations regarding collection development.

1) Give careful attention to selection of materials in the specialties of applied sociology/social policy and of methodology: quantitative approaches. These areas are very important to the Department and were found relatively weak (although the Library held over 80 percent of the materials on the lists for these specialties).

2) Maintain an organizational and budgetary structure that groups the social sciences together. Sociology is highly interdisciplinary and closely linked to other social science fields that have departments on campus. It makes good sense for the Library to group, for purposes of selection and acquisition, materials for Sociology with Political Science, Psychology, Urban Planning, and other social science fields.

3) Regularly monitor the condition of core journals for Sociology and develop a list of core journals for all the social sciences. Core journals are heavily used, damaged, vandalized, and stolen. Since evidence suggests a handful of core journals meet a majority of patrons' needs for journals, core journals deserve special attention.

The areas where the methods used might by modified are:

1) The project was unusually thorough, but extremely time-consuming. Colorado and Stanford did not, for example, account for every copy of sampled entries held nor did they search the holdings of other libraries for items never acquired. Of course, Stanford and Colorado missed much valuable data. Nevertheless, future collection evaluations should streamline the methodology.

2) Because the lists chosen to evaluate the graduate collection were bibliographies in surveys of the specialties, they covered a wide range of aspects of the specialties. But do such bibliographies cover materials used in research? Should future evaluations use bibliographies in monographs that deal with one aspect of a specialty? Certainly, lacking evidence that research monographs have more appropriate bibliographies than surveys, it was better to choose the bibliography in a survey like the Handbook of Medical Sociology than one in, say, a monograph on the sociology of pediatry. But the differences, if any, between a collection evaluation based on bibliographies in surveys and an evaluation based on bibliographies in monographs, deserve further investigation.

3) By using authoritative lists, a collecton evaluation will look for materials that have, in some sense, stood the test of time. But this method fails to cover the Library's performance in selecting, acquiring, and processing, the most recent important material. Future evaluations should develop a technique that will identify important, very recent publications. Announcements of forthcoming publications and recommendations for acquisitions from faculty may be some of the sources employed.

APPENDIX A

BIBLIOGRAPHIES FOR EVALUATION
OF UICC LIBRARY'S COLLECTION
SUPPORTING SPECIALTIES OF THE SOCIOLOGY DEPARTMENT

Specialty	Bibliography
1. Applied Sociology/Social Policy	George Klein, "Bibliography" [Applied Sociology/Social Policy. (Chicago, 1981)]
2. Criminology/Delinquency	Clayton A. Hartjen, Crime and Criminalization 2d ed (NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1978) pp. 233-250.
3. Medical Sociology	Handbook of Medical Sociology 3d ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1979) pp. 475-503.
4. Methodology: Qualitative Approaches	Howard Schwartz and Jerry Jacobs, Qualitative Sociology: A Method to the Madness (NY: Free Press, 1979) pp. 429-437.
5. Methodology: Quantitative Approaches	Kenneth D. Bailey, Methods of Social Research (NY: Free Press, 1978) pp. 453-467.
6. Occupations/Professions	John B. Cullen, The Structure of Professionalism: A Quantitative Examination (NY: Petrocelli, 1978) pp. 259-281.
7. Political Sociology	Edward W. Lehman, Political Society: A Macrosociology of Politics (NY: Columbia University Press, 1977) pp. 219-230.
8. Race/Ethnic/Minority Relations	Reid Luhman and Stuart Gilman, Race and Ethnic Relations: The Social and Political Experience of Minority Groups (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1980) pp. 302-319.
9. Social Organization/Formal/Complex	Charles Perrow, Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1979) pp. 248-262.

Specialty	Bibliography
10. Social Psychology	James W. Vander Zanden, Social Psychology (NY: Random House, 1981) pp. 447-479.
11. Sociology of Aging/Social Gerontology	Beth B. Hess and Elizabeth W. Markson, Aging and Old Age: An Introduction to Social Gerontology (NY: Macmillan, 1980) pp. 335-359.
12. Sociology of Work	Curt Tausky, Work Organizations: Major Theoretical Perspectives (Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock, 1978) pp. 208-228.
13. Urban Sociology	Claude S. Fischer et al., Networks and Places: Social Relations in the Urban Setting (NY: Free Press, 1977) pp. 205-223.

SELECTED PORTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

COLLECTION ANALYSIS PROJECT

Task Force on Collection Assessment

Final Report

Task Force Members:

Susan Baldwin
Dorothy Coil
Robert J. Havlik
Stephen M. Hayes, Chair
Dorothy Pedtke
Kathryn Ryan-Zeugner

Joseph Lauck, Secretary

Notre Dame, Indiana

June 10, 1981

COLLECTION ASSESSMENT OF THE METALLURGICAL ENGINEERING COLLECTION

The purpose of this paper is to report the results of an assessment of the library collections in metallurgy and materials science, and to comment on the methodologies used and whether these methodologies can be used to analyze other collection areas of the Engineering Library.

Department of Metallurgical Engineering and Materials Science

The department provides classes in theoretical and applied subjects pertaining to metallurgy and materials science leading to the Bachelor of Science in Metallurgical Engineering as well as graduate curriculum leading to the Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy degrees. The faculty in April 1981 consisted of five full-time faculty and two professors emeriti. There are 14 graduate students and 40 undergraduates.

Determining the Needs of the Department

The method used to determine the current needs of the faculty was to prepare and analyze a profile of current interests. A list of terms was compiled from the index to Library of Congress classes Q and T. The list selected was descriptive of the major classifications dealing with the nature, behavior and use of materials including major metals and alloys.

A list of 88 terms with their accompanying LC classification numbers was circulated to the entire departmental faculty to select terms of interest. Numerous areas of applied metals and metallurgy were eliminated at once as being not of interest. The remaining list was then assembled by LC class number. It was found that the terms fell into 13 basic classifications listed below:

TA 409	Fracture
TA 417	Properties and Tests of Materials
TA 418	Specific Properties of Materials
TA 459	Metals/General Works
TA 460	Metal Fatigue
TA 462	Corrosion
TA 464-479	Iron and Steel and Ferrous Alloys
TA 480-491	Non-Ferrous Alloys
TN 600-679	Metallurgy/General

TN 680-689	Electro-Metallurgy
TN 690-699	Metallography
TN 700-757	Ferrous Metallurgy
TN 758-799	Non-Ferrous Metallurgy

Since all of the above classifications have been within the collection policy of the Engineering Library the entire list was used for the preliminary examination of existing holdings.

Analysis of Current Shelflist Holdings

The first study was an analysis of the shelflist holdings by profile classification and five-year groups of the imprint dates of volumes in the Engineering Library. The results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Analysis of shelflist by profile subject and five-year groups of imprint date.

		Volumes							
Profile subject	Call No.	Pre-1949	1950-1954	1955-1959	1960-1964	1965-1969	1970-1974	1975-1979	1980
Fracture	TA 409	0	0	0	0	7	22	25	2
Properties and Tests of Materials	TA 417	1	0	0	3	6	5	8	1
Specific Properties of Materials	TA 418	0	0	0	1	37	32	43	2
Metals/General	TA 459	18	17	4	13	11	4	0	0
Metal Fatigue	TA 460	25	24	20	29	21	22	6	1
Corrosion	TA 462	10	2	11	10	16	15	18	1
Iron and Steel and Ferrous Alloys	TA464-479	33	10	14	11	13	5	10	1
Non-Ferrous Alloys	TA480-491	27	11	12	14	12	6	4	1
Metallurgy/General	TN600-679	39	17	22	21	27	15	10	0
Electro-Metallurgy	TN680-689	1	3	4	7	8	11	13	1
Metallography	TN690-699	60	27	37	42	45	48	26	2
Ferrous Metallurgy	TN700-757	57	20	22	22	23	12	7	0

It became apparent from this study that there was a gradual change in collection policy in the department after 1965. New areas in materials science (TA) began to be collected after this date and older areas in metallurgy (TN) began to decline or at best held at a maintenance level.

Further discussions with the department faculty revealed that the 13 classifications indicated the broadest interests of the group, and only areas they

were actively interested in developing were the eight materials science areas (TA).

Using the eight selected areas in materials science, it was now possible to analyze the past and current successes in building collections in depth.

Selection of Metals Abstracts as a Standard List of References

The standard bibliography in the field of metallurgy, A Brief Guide to Sources of Metals Information, by Marjorie R. Hyslop, is now outdated. The core of the monograph section of the revised edition is to be compiled from "Section 72--Special Publications" in Metals Abstracts. Metals Abstracts has been published since 1968 by the American Society for Metals and the Metals Society. Section 72, "Special Publications," contains reviews of "symposia in book form with contents list; books; and new journals."

Methodology Used with Metals Abstracts

An analysis of the total number of citations in Section 72 of Metals Abstracts showed the following number of citations for each abstract year:

1975	241 citations
1976	254 citations
1977	337 citations
1978	403 citations
1979	451 citations
1980	460 citations

A study of the range of imprint dates cited in each abstract year was made. Table 2 demonstrates that the 1975 Metals Abstracts contained a good sample of publications issued during the period 1970-1974 and the 1979 Metals Abstracts contained a good sample of publications issued during the period 1975-1979. After new journal titles, pre-print papers and subjects in which collecting was eliminated, sufficient citations remained to make a valid assessment of the efforts at collection building. It was decided that Metals Abstracts for the years 1975 and 1979 would make an excellent sample to study.

Table 2. Analysis of Metals Abstracts by year and imprint date of citations.

	Abstract Year					
	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980
Imprint Year:						
1972	7	2				
1973	37	4		2		
1974	112	27	2	0	2	1
1975	42	117	27	5	6	1
1976		57	87	20	11	7
1977			33	212	33	8
1978				104	164	21
1979					107	194
1980						73

The parameters and methodologies of the study were as follows: the first step was to eliminate from the Metals Abstracts list new journal titles and pre-prints which the library would not normally purchase. Since the purpose of the study was to analyze for significant factors affecting the nature of materials science literature and the success or failure in selection of items for purchase, the next task was to identify those items in the 1975 and 1979 Metals Abstracts already in the library system. This was done by checking both the Engineering card catalog and the union card catalog in the main library. The remainder of the unpurchased citations were then classified into the eight materials science classifications of interest. A large percentage of the publications in materials science were collections of papers or products of conferences or symposiums.

The department felt that the present approval plan was inadequate since it did not pick up publications of the three professional societies of interest to the department (i.e., American Society of Metals, the Metals Society and the American Society for Testing Materials). The ordering activity on the non-approval budget allotment compensated for this. To prove the point, it was decided to analyze those items in Metals Abstracts which we had purchased versus those we had not purchased to see whether they were published by one of the

above big three societies or were published by other corporate groups or commercial publishers.

Conclusions of the Study of the Materials Collection

The results of the two studies above are given in Table 3. These results have allowed us to derive several conclusions on the collection in materials science:

(1) An overwhelming portion of the literature in materials science is published in the form of conference proceedings or collected papers versus monographs.

(2) The similarity of the ratio of purchased to non-purchased conferences and to purchased and non-purchased monographs indicates that the library is collecting a fair cross-section of conferences versus monographs of interest which are available.

(3) The data on the purchase or non-purchase of association publications indicate that there is a stronger collection of association publications than anticipated.

Table 3. Comparison of citations of interest held and citations of interest not held as selected from the 1975 and 1979 Metals Abstracts combined, by percent of conference publications versus percent of monographs.

	Percent of Conference Publications	Percent of Monographs
Citations held	70.83%	29.16%
Citations not held	71.52%	28.40%

Comparison of citations of interest held and citations of interest not held, as selected from the 1975 and 1979 Metals Abstracts combined, by percent of publications issued by ASM, IM and ASTM versus publications issued by other corporate or commercial publishers.

	Percent Issued by Associations	Percent Issued by Other Publishers
Citations held	83.30%	16.60%
Citations not held	27.63%	72.37%

Since a study of the approval plan showed there is adequate coverage of the major monographs published in the field, the disproportion between association publications purchased and items of other publishers not purchased is caused by the failure to pick up literature published by smaller publishers, institutions and associations. The library should be more aware than it has been of the publications of smaller associations, university departmental symposiums and foreign symposiums published in English.

A count of all titles listed in the 1975 and 1979 Metals Abstracts showed a 142 percent increase in conferences cited and a 243 percent increase in pamphlets, monographs and reference works cited between the two years. The large number of conference publications held by the library also indicates a faster aging collection than in other fields, since the obsolescence rate of conference literature is much faster than for monographs and approaches that of periodical literature.

Comments on Techniques Used and Their Applicability to Other Collection Assessment Projects

(1) The collection assessment profile provided by the faculty was the most helpful part of the assessment project. The request for defining the profile was made at a faculty meeting. It was only after some personal meetings that the areas of collecting interest versus general interests were further defined. It is recommended that in the future some sort of rating be asked concerning the degree of interest and the degree of collection growth expected for each subject area.

(2) One has to be careful when preparing an interest profile for a department, that the terms used are consistent with the terminology in the field.

(3) Metals Abstracts, like other abstracting journals, groups its abstracts into broad categories. One has to be aware that Section 72 is a grouping by form of publication, not by specific subject. The method of citing conferences

between 1975 and 1979 also changed and it was difficult to determine which entry to look up, especially for conferences. To properly use the printed Metals Abstracts Section 72 as a selection tool, a subject background is needed--first to identify items in the card catalog which we have, and second to identify items that were not purchased which match our subject profile. This is subjective, especially when such a large percentage of the literature is composed of collections of indexed papers.

(4) A plan should be made before starting a collection assessment study. It should be flexible enough to handle any changes in direction that might be apparent as preliminary data are gathered. The need for further definition of the profile and modification of sample years of Metals Abstracts are examples. There is also a tendency to want to add more details, but experience has shown that it is better to stay within a limited number of parameters in the study.

The preliminary work on the profile took at least two hours plus two hours for the preparation and presentation of the materials to the faculty. It took the faculty two weeks to review the profile and the librarian spent another two hours of personal interviews.

The preliminary study of the current collection via the shelflist check took at least one week to complete but the gathering of data took about three hours and one hour to tabulate the data and draw conclusions.

The check of the main catalog for cited titles involved many people from searchers to professional librarians. While the Engineering Librarian's sampling showed one and a half minutes involved per title, non-professionals reported much longer search times for many conference titles. An estimated 10 hours of searching was involved.

The analysis of Metals Abstracts including selecting, classifying and tabulating data for cited items not purchased took about one hour per classification.

Results

One of the reasons for the selection of the metallurgical collection of the Engineering Library for study was to help relieve some of the anxieties of the faculty in the Department of Metallurgical Engineering and Materials Science caused by adoption of the approval plan. They feared that they would miss many of the conference publications as well as publications issued by the major metallurgical and materials science associations.

The study showed this not to be the case.

(a) The closeness of the ratio of purchased conference to non-purchased conferences indicates that the library is collecting a fair cross-section of conferences versus monographs of interest which are available.

(b) The data on the purchase or non-purchase of associations publications show that the library has a stronger collection of associations publications than anticipated.

If there is any lack in coverage of material it may be due to the failure to pick up literature published by smaller publishers, institutions and associations. This may be due to limited funds. But the study has shown that the library must pay more attention to the review of this literature for selection of the more valuable items to be selected for our collection.

A copy of the report was sent to the department and they made several comments upon which direct action is being taken.

(1) "Our interests in certain topics in the QC (physics) and QD (chemistry) classes are deeper and broader than might be expected; consequently we must continue to monitor closely acquisitions in these areas." To act upon this suggestion the library is now circulating new book lists from the Chemistry/ Physics as well as the Mathematics libraries.

(2) "I am not sure that the obsolescence rate of conference literature is higher than that of monographs. The conference proceedings which we have

been seeking will have great value for a minimum of five to ten years." This calls for extra care in the selection of conference proceedings. Perhaps a future study could be made to determine the number of applicable papers that should be present in a conference publications before the proceedings are purchased versus requesting selected papers on interlibrary loan.

The work we have done has already proved valuable in a better appreciation of the library as well as providing the librarians with further data upon which to base even better service. The suggestions for improving the techniques used will also bring many dividends when studying other collection areas in the Engineering Library.

(reprinted from earlier Kit)

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

THE COLLECTION EVALUATION PROGRAM

September 16, 1977

A series of collection evaluations has been carried out at Stanford during the last year and a half, and will be continued during the next few years in order to gain a fairly systematic picture of

the quality - that is the research and teaching adequacy - of the collections. Funded by a portion of special endowment revenues, the evaluations are intended: 1) to provide us with means for our bibliographers to learn and to know better their own portions of the multi-million volume research collections, 2) to establish useful bases for the revision of Stanford's Collection Development Policy Statement, 3) to provide data for us to use in coordinating some aspects of our selection process with the University of California at Berkeley, 4) to provide information on which to build deliberate and shaped plans and specific recommendations for the enlargement and improvement of our library collections, and to do so in the most useful and efficient way, and with the greatest economy, 5) to add support to our book budget requests, 6) to make possible the most productive expenditure of library resources.

The program is tiered in a manner similar to that developed by Webb at Colorado. The need for evaluation is sometimes suggested by responses to brief questionnaires used by the Collection Development staff when interviewing faculty in their fields of specialty (see Appendix). The faculty are asked to evaluate impressionistically the adequacy of the library collection in their own fields for teaching and research. Other times, evaluations are undertaken as part of a systematic effort to sample collection effectiveness in large subject fields within the library's collections, especially where oral tradition or complaint suggest problems.

Normally, a sampling is first searched, with a statistically significant number of titles in each of a number of subfields. For example, to evaluate the collections in early modern French history, we searched 165 titles from Robert Mandrou's, Introduction à la France Moderne, divided into categories

such as Humanism, Philosophy, History of Science, Religious Life, Art and Artists, Political and Social Theory, Popular Life, etc. When, by consulting the academic program needs and Collection Development Policy statement levels, we have found that holdings are substantially lower than programs warrant, we mount more thorough searches and develop both current and retrospective acquisitions campaigns to rectify the inadequacies discovered.

In other instances, such as the Sciences or "hard" Social Sciences, evaluative techniques are specially developed or borrowed from the literature to provide information about specific problems of collection availability or quality.

Evaluations have been completed or are under way in over twenty-two different subjects in the Humanities and Social Sciences, and effort in the Sciences is planned. Graduate students who have completed their comprehensive examinations in the field of study being evaluated are normally used to conduct the evaluations and, as I have said above, we have found it useful to provide some orientation and training for them. These graduate student bibliographers are paid three dollars an hour at current rates, and an average sampling evaluation on the Coale or Webb model takes from 100 to 200 hours, at a cost of 300 to 600 dollars. I would agree with Webb that the benefits have far outweighed the costs. Each graduate student is supervised by a library subject specialist in the area being evaluated. The subject specialist, the department faculty and, in many cases, the graduate student, join in evaluating and selecting bibliographies for searching, keeping in mind the goals and scope of the academic program, the mission of the library collection and the Collection Development Policy statement parameters. The choice of bibliographies or

other tools used for evaluation is a crucial one.

Four basic survey techniques for evaluation have thus far been used, each having a rather different goal:

1) A check of a sampling chosen from one or more accepted important subject bibliographies.

2) A check of one or more monographic or journal article bibliographies of works on the cutting edge of research in a discipline or subject.

3) A careful search of all titles in a significant subject bibliography in areas where weakness was revealed by methods one or two above.

4) For initial surveys in Antrhopology and Economics, checks of basic lists of most-used and valuable titles to determine collection adequacy for graduate instruction, and the availability of basic materials.

Whenever possible, methods one, two, or three will also involve checking holdings at the University of California, Berkeley, using their records, to provide comparable data, and to take advantage of the Berkeley-Stanford Research Library Program cooperation. If Berkeley has an item we may well decide not to purchase it; if it is an expensive item, a journal or a series, the two libraries may agree on a single location or share the purchase.

Each evaluation must result in a formal report, submitted through the supervising subject specialist to the Assistant Director for Collection Development. The report is normally divided into two sections, the first consists of evaluative information and a description of the evaluation process, and the second part contains the data: at Stanford this usually tells us - as a minimum - by subfield and total, 1) the number of titles checked, 2) the number and percentage at both Stanford and Berkeley, 3) the number and percentage at Stanford only, 4) at Berkeley only, and

5) at neither. Other types of data relevant to the goals of the particular evaluation may also be added. The introductory data includes: 1) the nature and goal of the evaluation, 2) the source, 3) the sampling used, 4) problems encountered (including unusual patterns of difficulty in finding the titles and materials found while searching which may suggest a different result than the data would imply), 5) general comments about the collections, 6) a list of specific areas of unusual strength or weakness, and finally - and the importance of this part of an evaluation cannot be overemphasized - 7) a plan or campaign of action to develop and build collections in areas of undesirable weakness (areas the Collection Development Policy indicates should be stronger than the findings indicate that they are). Often a list of desiderata, ranked in importance is included, but this is usually an appendix rather than the substance of the plan for improvement. Normally the subject specialist, and perhaps faculty, will be involved in preparing this section of the report.

We always prepare a summary of each report. Gathered together and arranged, the summaries are used with administrators, for reporting on the progress of the program, etc. The summaries normally include: 1) the evaluation title, 2) the departments or fields which the evaluation covers or touches, 3) a note about the sampling, 4) a summary of findings including areas of special strength or weakness, and 5) a brief conclusion including action to be taken.

We have found that areas requiring particular care in planning collection evaluations are the selection of fields for evaluation (based upon faculty recommendation or suspicion of areas of weakness), the selection of bibliographies and other evaluative tools, the plan of the search, the selection of able, careful and precise searchers, and the preparation of

reports of quality and accuracy containing standardized, consistent and program-related information and data. Reports presenting the perceptions and judgements of a trained graduate student with faculty and subject specialist contributions, as well as standardized statistical data representing the library's holdings, have proved as useful to us as data concerning specific items held or not held.

As a result of its collection evaluation program, Stanford expects to share in the following benefits:

1) To gain a more accurate understanding of the scope, depth, and utility of collections.

2) As a guide and basis for collection planning.

3) As an aid to the preparation of a Collection Development Policy.

4) To measure the effectiveness of a Collection Development Policy.

5) To ascertain collection adequacy or quality.

6) To rectify inadequacies in, and improve, library holdings.

7) To focus human and monetary resources on collection areas most needing attention.

8) To demonstrate the need for book budget increases.

9) To show administrators that something <u>is</u> being done to change the "bottomless pit" image of library acquisitions budgets.

An on-going, consistent and well-thought-out campaign of collection evaluation can be carried out over a number of years as need, time, and resources dictate, and can assist the library to obtain and maintain the excellent and responsibe collection which is its goal. A sound collection evaluation program interacts with the Collection Development Policy, with the allocation of funds in support of collection development, and with the pruning of collections informing the principal and most useful constituents of any library's Collection Development Program.

APPENDIX

Date:_____

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT IMPRESSION

Name:_____

Dept:_____

Collection Specialty:_____

1. Collection strength for department level work:

_____1. Basic undergraduate

_____2. Undergraduate honors

_____3. Graduate instruction

_____4. Graduate research

_____5. Professorial research

2. The strength of the collection in supporting one's own research:

_____1. Basic information; a marginal collection

_____2. Adequate for reference; provides most current materials and coverage of most significant hsitorical aspects

_____3. Satisfactory for basic independent research

_____4. Contains most materials needed for independent research

PHM:ba

Economics: Adequacy and Availability of the Collections at Stanford

Departments/ Fields:

Economics
Economic History
Business
Mathematics

Sampling:

398 monographic titles
225 periodicals

(Chosen from graduate reading lists on the basis of citation frequency, Stanford authorship, known importance, and student enrollment in courses for which books were assigned.)

Note:

As in the case of the Anthropology study, this was designed to deal with possession and availability of basic materials; therefore Berkeley's holdings were not consulted. The study is important, however, in comparing Main and Jackson Library holdings.

Findings:

The libraries of Stanford possess 96.5% of the monographic titles and 91.6% of the serials titles.

In mid-November, 93.5% of the 398 monographs could be located, and 87.2% were available on the shelves. At least 85% of the titles in each of the 16 sub-divisions surveyed could be found in the libraries of Stanford.

Main Library holds 86.9% of the 398 titles (and an average of 87.4% of the titles calculated by the 16 sub-divisions), while Jackson holds 80.1%of the titles (or 81.3% average of the sub-divisions).

Main Library has holdings of great strength (over 90% of titles) in 7 sub-divisions and is weak in 2 (under 80% of titles). Jackson is very strong in three areas and weak in five.

Conclusions:

Overall, this is a very good record - with a notable exception which will be mentioned below. In the case of Economics it is as it was with Anthropology: Main Library's reputation for unavailability is not supported by holdings or available statistics; the problem rests elsewhere, perhaps in the ability of graduate students to negotiate a rather complex bibliographic control system to find books, a tendency to use the Jackson Library because of comfort and non-circulation policy for journals, and perhaps because of a lack of adequate bibliographic instruction or orientation in the past.

Conclusions:
(continued)

While the Main and Jackson collections interlock adequately in most areas (see table), neither is strong in Economic History (and Main Library will require more effort to evaluate and develop the collection in that field), and both are strong in Urban Economics - as perhaps they should be. Greater coordination in current collection development activity, based on the results of this study, should be undertaken. On the other hand, it would appear unneccessary to devote special efforts to retrospective activity in Economics, except in Economic History; emphasis should instead be placed on current acquisition, to be sure that collections in all sub-divisions improve in the future.

Areas of Strength and Weakness

+ = Strength 0 = Weakness

Area	Main	Jackson	Math
1. Economic Thought	+	0	
2. Economic History		0	
3. Math.Econ./Game Theory	0		+
4. Econometrics	0	+	
5. Labor Theory		0	
6. Urban Economics	+	+	
7. International Trade and Finance		+	
8. Monetary Theory			
9. Development			
10. Public Finance			
11. Price Theory/Microeconomics	+		
12. Macroeconomics	+		
13. Industrial Organization		+	
14. Alternative Approaches (eg. Marxism)	+	0	
15. Applied Econometrics, Bus. Cycles, Math. Growth Theory	+		
16. Welfare Theory	+	0	